AN

ADDRESS

TO

BRIAN EDWARDS, Esq;

[Price One Shilling and Six-Pence.]

BRITISH MUSEUM

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1102. k. 18.
4

AN

ADDRESS

TO

BRIAN EDWARDS, Esq;

CONTAINING

REMARKS

On his PAMPHLET, entitled,

"THOUGHTS on the late proceedings of Government, respecting the Trade of the West India Islands with the United States of America."

ALSO

OBSERVATIONS

On some Parts of a PAMPHLET, lately published by the West India Planters and Merchants, entitled,

"Considerations on the present State of the Intercourse between his Majesty's Sugar Colonies and the Dominions of the United States of America."

By JOHN STEVENSON.

LONDON:
Printed for W. NICOLL, N°. 51, St. Paul's Church-Yard.
MDCCLXXXIV.

W. Musgrave.

ERRATA.

Page 6. line 18. for better, *read* bettered.
12, line 3. for feel it, *read* feel them.
17. line 2. for made, *read* mad.
35. line 3. for freight, *read* freights.
43. line 27. for pocket, *read* pockets,
57. line 30. for advantage, *read* advantages.
61. line 23. for impofts, *read* imports.
71. line 14. for entertained, *read* entertain.
76. line 22. for 62, *read* 26.
82. line 27. for their, *read* her.
88. line 28. for flumber, *read* lumber.

BRITISH MUSEUM

AN ADDRESS TO BRIAN EDWARDS, Esq;

SIR,

CONSIDERING the connexion which formerly subsisted between this country and the thirteen Revolted Colonies, the rise, progress, and issue of the late unnatural war, and our present situation with the now United States of America, I am convinced that all future connexion, excepting such as shall arise from the reciprocal interest of individuals, ought to be cautiously avoided by this country. Under those impressions I read Lord Sheffield's pamphlet, intituled, "Observations on the Commerce of the American "States," with great pleasure; and, with an earnest wish to judge impartially on the important subject, I have also perused your Animadversions on his

Lordſhip's tract with attention and aſtoniſhment. As the allowing of the American States a free trade with our Weſt India Iſlands would, in my opinion, be productive of very fatal conſequences to this country, I cannot help feeling a conſiderable degree of anxiety on that account; and, as your pamphlet has been publiſhed with the manifeſt view of inducing our Government to admit of that intercourſe, I ſhall immediately proceed to an inveſtigation of its contents. The obligations I lie under, as a Briton, to promote the welfare of the Empire, call upon me to uſe my utmoſt endeavours to prevent the pernicious effects of your publication; and that reſpect which I owe to the intereſted Public (at whoſe bar I now meet you) require me to exhibit that openneſs, candour, and impartiality, which ought always to mark the conduct of every public writer.

After telling us there is an eſſential difference attending the conduct and determinations of private perſons, and thoſe of men in power, you ſay, "A ſingle error in the councils of a public Miniſ-
"ter may involve in it the fate of nations, and the
"welfare of poſterity—We have all been melan-
"choly witneſſes to the truth of theſe remarks;
"and can bear teſtimony, from our own remem-
"brance, of the fatal effects that one eminent
"miſtake in the conduct of a great and able
"Stateſman has produced: the revolt of three
"millions of our fellow ſubjects—The diſmem-

"berment

" berment of the Empire, and a combination of " impending evils, from which death ſeems our " only refuge."

That thirteen of our American Colonies revolted, and that the Britiſh Empire has been materially diſmembered, are facts which cannot be controverted; but, ſurely, Sir, they are not the fatal effects of any *one* miſtake, in the conduct of any *one* Stateſman. The former was occaſioned by the miſtaken policy of thoſe peace-makers who retained Canada, and repealed an *oppoſed*, *uninforced* ſtamp-act; and the latter was clearly owing to the unnatural efforts of thoſe Britons who abetted the American rebellion; to that ſhamefully languid manner in which our Miniſters carried on the late war; and, above all, to the baſe conduct of thoſe who had the ſupreme command of our fleets and armies. Had we kept the conquered iſlands, (Martinique and Guadaloupe) and given back Canada to France, the Americans would not have dared to rebel againſt their parent ſtate. The vicinity of the French would have kept them in a ſtate of conſtant humility; and fear for their own ſafety would, in a great meaſure, have ſupplied their want of affection for their mother-country. Had Lord North, and his colleagues in adminiſtration, carried on the war with proper ſpirit, brought the audacious abettors of rebellion to condign puniſhment, and put our fleets and armies under the command of honeſt men, the now United States

of America would ſtill have made part of the Britiſh Empire. The numberleſs riſques which conſtantly attend human life, may juſtly be called "a "combination of impending dangers, from which "death ſeems our only refuge;" but what thoſe dangers are, which you allude to, as the effects of one eminent miſtake of a great and able Stateſman, I am at a loſs to know, unleſs you mean our national debt, with all its train of diſagreeable conſequences.

In treating on the neceſſity of ſettling a commercial intercourſe with our late fellow-ſubjects, you ſay, "The baſis of every permanent com-"mercial alliance between diſtant nations, is "*mutual advantage, founded in mutual confidence:* "ſurely then it is our intereſt and our duty to "endeavour, by ſoftening animoſity, to reſtore "that confidence which we have unhappily loſt." I readily grant, Sir, that mutual advantage, founded on mutual confidence, is, and muſt be, the baſis of every commercial alliance between diſtant nations; but the conduct of the United States of America has been ſuch as to render it utterly impoſſible for Great Britain to put any confidence in them. You ſay, "It is our intereſt and "our duty to endeavour, by ſoftening animoſity, "to reſtore that confidence which we have unhap-"pily loſt." Here, Sir, I cannot help admiring your extraordinary *modeſty:* Great Britain, according to your expreſſion, has proved exceeding-

ly

ly faithleſs and oppreſſive to her *affectionate* and *dutiful* children. Review the paſſage, Sir; recollect the conduct of the Americans, reſpecting the Saratoga convention and the fifth article of the treaty of peace, and you will ſee abundant reaſon to make a material alteration.

" By an enlarged and liberal policy on our part, " (ſay you) paſſion and prejudice will at length " happily ſubſide, and then, and not till then, will " intereſt have its natural bias on the mind of " America." Pray, Sir, what has Great Britain done to the Americans, that can be ſuppoſed to require ſuch conceſſion and liberality on the part of the former? When the French committed depredations on ſome of the Back Settlements in 1754, they called aloud to the Mother Country for help, and ſhe flew to their aſſiſtance; but, when Great Britain required them to aſſiſt her in bearing that heavy burthen which ſhe had loaded herſelf with on their account, they denied their obligation as coloniſts, and renounced their allegiance as ſubjects; they formed an alliance with our natural enemy, their former invaders; and they contended with us in arms for independence. Even their independency has been ſolemnly acknowledged, and the loyaliſts left to their mercy; and yet we are told, after all, that an enlarged and liberal policy on our part is abſolutely neceſſary, for the very important purpoſe of inducing *impaſſioned* and *prejudiced* America to purſue her own intereſt!

" Allied

" Allied to us as they ſtill are, (ſay you) by " the deareſt ties of conſanguinity, let us ſtill hope " that the Americans will yet prove themſelves, " as they have hitherto proved, our beſt friends " and cuſtomers in peace, and in war our firmeſt " allies."

That there are ties of conſanguinity ſubſiſting betwixt many of the inhabitants of this country and thoſe of America, I readily admit; but that ſuch ties will operate materially to the advantage of this country, no man, who duly conſiders their paſt conduct, can poſſibly imagine. Whether the Americans have *hitherto* (or rather previous to the late war) proved our beſt friends and cuſtomers in peace, and in war our firmeſt allies, I ſhall not take upon me now to determine; but I am perſuaded that, all things duly conſidered, Great Britain has not, to ſay the leaſt, been *much* better by her connexion with thoſe colonies which now form the United States of America. So long as our ports are continued open to them, I preſume they will endeavour to trade with us as far as they ſhall deem it conſiſtent with their own intereſt; but I hope that no Britiſh Miniſter will ever think of forming an alliance with independent America. Having almoſt doubled our national debt in fighting their battles as our colonies, and expended more than *one hundred millions* in endeavouring to compel their obedience as ſubjects and prevent their ſeparation from the Mother Country, ſhall we complete our ruin, by madly engaging to de-

fend

fend them, in all time coming, as our allies? Here, Sir, it is but fair to own, that you are not alone in this matter. The many friends of the American rebellion, who unfortunately ſat in our Houſes of Parliament, ſeldom recommended the granting of independence, without adviſing, at the ſame time, the forming of an alliance with the United States; but can we believe that ſuch parliamentary conduct was truly laudable; or that the advice given was calculated to promote the intereſt of their country? For my part, I think they acted unworthy of their character as ſenators; and I anxiouſly wiſh them to undergo a ſincere repentance, and thorough amendment.

In your third paragraph, you ſay, "But we "are now aſſured by men of high rank and great "authority, that ſuch generoſity is not only unne-"ceſſary but dangerous; for that, in ſpite of "American reſentment and independency, this "kingdom muſt neceſſarily poſſeſs as much of "their commerce as we wiſh to retain. If this be "indeed the caſe, what a dreadful monument of "human infirmity does Great Britain exhibit to "the world? And what have we to conſole our-"ſelves with, for the millions we have expended, "and the blood we have ſpilt? We have diſmem-"bered the nobleſt Empire in the univerſe; —— "and, for what? *To make aſſurance ſure!* to poſ-"ſeſs ourſelves of an object already our own, and "of which nothing it ſeems could have deprived "us."

I fully

I fully agree with Lord Sheffield, Sir, in saying, That the enlarged and liberal policy which you recommend would not only be unneceſſary but dangerous; and I am of opinion, that this country will, in ſpite of American reſentment and independency, poſſeſs at leaſt as much of their commerce as will do us good. Although I firmly believe this to be the caſe, Sir, I deny that Great Britain has, by that conduct which you allude to, exhibited a ſtriking monument of human infirmity to the world. I freely confeſs, however, that we have nothing to conſole ourſelves with for the millions we have expended, and the blood we have ſpilt; and with heart-felt grief for my injured country I likewiſe admit, that we have diſmembered the nobleſt Empire in the world; we may thank our peace-makers, and their numerous aſſiſtants for both. In the cloſe of the paragraph now under conſideration, your words have a direct tendency to impoſe upon your readers reſpecting the object of our late unhappy war with the revolted Colonies. You certainly know, Sir, that the *trade* of the colonies was *not* the object of our purſuit in the war, but ſimply that of obtaining ſome aſſiſtance from the growing opulence of our coloniſts, to pay the intereſt of that debt which Great Britain had loaded herſelf with, by driving the devouring ſword from their habitations. This, Sir, was an object which could *not* be deemed already our own, and of which *nothing*, as you have thought proper to ſay, could have deprived us.

In your fourth paragraph, you ſay, " I have, " indeed, ever thought and ſaid, and ever ſhall " think and ſay, that the war with America, on " the part of Great Britain, was conceived in wick- " edneſs, and continued through inſanity; but I " had hopes, after the diſcipline we have under- " gone, that at length we were nearly cured of our " delirium; for we have been bliſtered and blooded, " pumped, purged, and chained to the earth."

Were I to believe your aſſertion, Sir, I ſhould thence conclude, that the moſt perſuaſive reaſoning, the moſt forcible argument, and the moſt convincing proof, would all prove utterly incapable of altering your opinion reſpecting either the motives of Great Britain in the commencement of the American war, or her conduct in its proſecution. But the truth is, Sir, I entertain a very different opinion on the ſubject. As the human mind can neither believe, nor diſbelieve any propoſition whatever, as a propoſition, but in proportion to the evidence which it ſees, or conceives that it ſees, for or againſt it, I am perſuaded that, ſo far as my arguments ſhall be found to carry clear and convincing evidence along with them, they muſt produce a material change in your mind: how far you will own that ſuch a change has been wrought, I pretend not, with any degree of preciſion, to determine. You tell us, " you ever ſhall think and " ſay, that the war with America, on the part of " Great Britain, was conceived in wickedneſs, and

"continued through insanity;" but on what ground, Sir, do you hazard the assertion? Can you possibly imagine, either that the proposition is self-evident, or that you are infinite in knowledge, and unerring in judgment? I cannot err in saying, the proposition in question is far from being self-evident; and I appeal to your own experience, whether your knowledge is not circumscribed by very narrow limits, and your judgment, in numberless instances, weak, mutable, and erroneous? I have ever thought, Sir, that the war with America, on the part of Great Britain, was conceived in justice, but unfortunately carried on under the baleful influence of timidity and self-interest; and that the hostile resistance of America "was conceived in wickedness, and continued thro' insanity." Great Britain had an undoubted right to call for the assistance of America, when hard pressed by an accumulated load of national debt, great part of which had been contracted by defending the latter against foreign invaders. That subject having already been so much exhausted, by writers on both sides of the question, that little new can now be advanced, I shall only offer a few remarks to your serious consideration. Without touching on the hackneyed argument in favour of the inseparability of *taxation* and *representation*, I take leave to insist, that in every community on earth, *taxation* and *protection* are always correlates, let the modes or forms of their several governments be what they may. The people

people are to ſupport that government, which, in return, is to rule and protect them; and it is abſurd to ſuppoſe, that any government can long continue to exiſt without ſuch general ſupport. As the American Colonies had always received ample protection from the Britiſh government, they certainly were bound to contribute to its ſupport. At the firſt of their oppoſition, they only objected to the mode of taxation, deſired that the legiſlature of Great Britain would name the ſum wanted, and ſaid they would raiſe it in their own way. Their wiſhes were fully complied with, and the Conciliatory Bill, allowing them to raiſe the money wanted in what manner they ſhould think beſt, paſſed on the 20th of February, 1775; but, unfortunately for every part of the Britiſh Empire, the Americans, deluded by thoſe among themſelves who thirſted for power and pre-eminence, and inſtigated by their factious demagogues here, inſiſted that the deſigns of the Britiſh Miniſtry were inſidious, and they rejected the propoſal with diſdain. Thus, Sir, although no ſubject can ever be entitled to privilege, excluſive of obligation, they hoſtilely oppoſed every demand, and haughtily rejected every propoſal made by their Parent ſtate, without ever making the leaſt offer on their part, or engaging to pay any one ſpecific ſum towards the ſupport of that government, which, at a very great expence of treaſure and blood, had long nouriſhed and defended them. Your remarks, reſpecting that

delirium under which you ſuppoſe Great Britain to have laboured, are, in my opinion, highly inſulting; and that Briton, who does not feel it as ſuch, muſt have but little regard for the honour of his country. We have been bliſtered, blooded, and purged, it is true; but has Rebel America been wholly free from ſuch evacuations? I am perſuaded Sir, that the revolted Colonies have experienced them to ſuch a degree, that they will long feel their fatal effects. They have not, indeed, been pumped and chained to the earth, ſuch operations have been peculiar to the American priſons, thoſe habitations of modern cruelty; for ſuch, the inhuman inflictors would, I am perſuaded, have been properly exalted, had not the traitorous conduct of ſome celebrated Britons prevented. Had our commanders by ſea and land done their duty, they would probably have prevented you from ſuppoſing Great Britain to have laboured under a delirium in the proſecution of the war. Our want of ſucceſs, in attempting to reduce the late rebellion, was not owing to the wiſdom of the American councils, the abilities of their generals, or the valour of their troops; but to that unnatural ſupport which was conſtantly given to their cauſe in the Britiſh Senate, and to the baſe conduct of thoſe who unfortunately were entruſted with the ſupreme command of our fleets and armies: of the two, the latter was clearly the moſt pernicious. But for the ſhameful omiſſions of our diſaffected commanders,

ders, Great Britain would, in all human probability, have prevailed in the great conteſt, and ultimately triumphed over all her enemies. You muſt know, Sir, that, had our commanders proved worthy of the great truſt repoſed in them by their country, the American rebellion would, at ſome particular periods, have been as effectually, and almoſt as eaſily cruſhed, as a ſilly moth under the thumb of its deſtroyer. The revolted Colonies, in league with France, aſſiſted by Spain and Holland, and abetted by many unnatural Britons, in and out of Parliament, (not to mention the Cabinet) would all, all have proved unequal to the taſk of ſucceſsfully oppoſing Great Britain in arms, had her naval and military commanders done their duty. The conduct of ſome men *here* was truly aſtoniſhing. That which no *one* man would probably have dared to attempt, was, by many, entered upon without fear, and effected without puniſhment. In the ſenate each gave countenance to his fellow-parricide; and by extending their arms, for the reception and protection of thoſe commanders who had proved ſucceſsful in the execution of their unnatural ſchemes, they formed a capacious ſanctuary, into which, every capital delinquent fled, and thought himſelf as ſecure as criminals of old at the horns of the Jewiſh altar. After all, Sir, the independency of the American States was granted at a time when they little expected it; and the honour and intereſt of the Empire were

were ſhamefully ſacrificed by the treaty of peace. The juſtice of the nation has hitherto ſlept over thoſe enormities; but I hope and truſt, Sir, that it will ſoon awake; that every capital culprit will be brought to trial; and that the ultimate inſtruments of the law will duly perform their awful office.

I am glad, Sir, inſtead of being ſorry, to find that there are a conſiderable party in the nation who appear to be ſtill labouring under that which you call "ſome *unlucky aſcendant*;" for they tell us, that the only method which now remains for *carrying on*, not of *improving* and *extending* a commercial intercourſe with our late fellow-ſubjects, is to treat them in all reſpects as a foreign people: to *open* our ports to, not to *ſhut* them againſt their ſhipping, as aliens and ſtrangers: and to make them ſenſible, that, having renounced the duties, they have forfeited all the privileges of Britiſh ſubjects. "The Americans, we are aſſured, "(ſay you) will be far from taking ſuch conduct "amiſs: nay, they will even applaud us for it, "and conſider it as a convincing proof of our li-"berality and friendſhip towards them." I will not take upon me, Sir, to ſay, that you never heard ſuch ſtrange language, but if you did, I am perſuaded that the ſpeaker actually laboured, at the time, under ſome *unlucky aſcendant*. However that may have been, I heſitate not to ſay, that the American States will have no right to take

ſuch

ſuch judicious and neceſſary conduct amiſs; and I will alſo add, that they muſt even applaud us for it: yet, I am far from thinking, that they can poſſibly conſider ſuch a wiſe procedure as a proof of our *generoſity* and *friendſhip* for them.

In page 5th, you ſay, "Mr. Burke, with his "uſual comprehenſive diſcernment, has expreſſed "a generous indignation againſt all prohibitory "ſchemes; and the accompliſhed Miniſter in the "direction of our finances (Mr. Pitt) brought into "Parliament a proviſional bill for the re-eſtabliſh-"ment of a commercial intercourſe between this "kingdom and America, founded on very benefi-"cial and enlarged principles; and which, had it "paſſed into a law, would, I am perſuaded, have "tended in its conſequences, not to the injury of "our trade and navigation, as was apprehended, "but, in a very eminent degree, to the ſupport and "encouragement of both."

Without taking any notice of the propriety, or impropriety of the encomiums you have thought proper to beſtow on Mr. Burke and Mr. Pitt, I take leave briefly to remark, that ſome folks are very generous in giving away that which does not immediately belong to them. Commerce, according to ſuch men, ought to be intirely free to every nation; and even crowns are to be parted with, and empires diſmembered, for the general benefit of mankind; provided that ſuch magnanimous liberality does not materially affect the generous giver.

giver. Although I am clearly of opinion, that the whole of the proviſional bill, for the re-eſtabliſhing of a commercial intercourſe between this kingdom and America, was very objectionable; I ſhall for the preſent content myſelf with making a few obſervations on that part which allowed the United States of America a free trade with our Weſt India Iſlands. That article, Sir, is of ſuch importance to Britain, that there is not, I am perſuaded, another country in the world where any individual would dare to propoſe a meaſure ſo obviouſly replete with national injury and ruin. In France, all profeſs an inviolable attachment to their ſovereign, and declare their readineſs to ſacrifice every private concern for the welfare of their country: but here, men value themſelves on account of their unnatural attachment to our enemies; and, aſtoniſhing to tell, they ſeem to think themſelves intitled to honour and emoluments for their diſaffection to their ſovereign, and treachery to their country. Many prefer their connexions as partizans to their obligations as Britons; and a conſiderable number ſhamefully purſue their private intereſt, at the imminent hazard of the ſtate. When the American trade-bill was under diſcuſſion in the Houſe of Commons, the late Lord Advocate of Scotland, we are told, ſaid, "He had converſed on "the ſubject with many reſpectable merchants of "Glaſgow, who all of them admitted that certain "inconveniencies would ariſe, but that neverthe-

"leſs,

" leſs, they highly approved of the preſent bill, and " thought the Houſe would be made, if they did " not paſs it immediately." His Lordſhip was ably anſwered by Sir Robert Herries, who ſaid; if the Americans were ſuffered to trade with the Weſt India Iſlands freely, they would get the greateſt part of the carrying trade into their hands. If the bill paſſed it would prove advantageous to him and ſome other individuals, but as a man of honour, a good citizen, and a member of the Houſe, he found himſelf bound to declare, it would do infinite miſchief to the country. It might, added he, make the fortunes of certain individuals; men, who had made purchaſes in America, and ſent agents there, and afterwards took thoſe agents into partnerſhip, and thus could either continue Engliſhmen, or become Americans, juſt as their intereſt or conveniency required. He himſelf might profit by the bill, in more than one inſtance; he had a houſe at Barcelona, in which he had been concerned more than thir y years, and he had, beſides, a conſiderable property in houſes at Oſtend, both which places muſt be materially benefited if the bill paſſed: but he ſhould ill-diſcharge the duty of a good citizen, if any perſonal conſideration ſhould make him loſe ſight of the welfare of his country, which would be greatly diſadvantaged by the preſent bill, and therefore he ſhould be againſt the Speaker's leaving the chair.

Surely, Sir, the above language is expreſſive of a clear head, and a good heart; and it does great

honour to Sir Robert, as a man, as a Briton, and as a ſenator. Such noble diſintereſtedneſs in a *modern* merchant, is not *always* to be met with; and it is highly worthy of univerſal imitation. I was exceedingly ſorry, Sir, to find that many of our then ſenators ſtrenuouſly endeavoured to paſs a bill which would conſiderably leſſen the number of our ſhipping and ſeamen, weaken our naval forces, and render us, ere long, an eaſy prey to our powerful and ambitious enemies. Whoever conſiders that, out of ſeventeen colonies in America, only two now remain to Great Britain, and that even thoſe two are, through the ignorance or treachery of our peace-makers, much diminiſhed in their value to this country, muſt conclude, that the admitting of the United States to a participation in the carrying-trade of our Weſt India Iſlands would greatly reduce our naval ſtrength, and accelerate the ruin of the Empire. As the Admiralty cannot man the royal navy, in time of war, any otherwiſe, according to the preſent ſyſtem, than by taking a ſufficient number of ſeamen from our private ſervices, it clearly follows, that every meaſure which has a tendency to reduce the quantity of our ſhipping, employed in thoſe ſervices, muſt proportionably reduce our natural ſtrength, and hazard the independence of our country. Whatever part of our former trade ſhall in future be carried on by ſhips belonging to ſtates in amity with us, it will be a real loſs to Britain; and whatever

ever portion of that loſt trade ſhall fall to the ſhare of our enemies, it muſt operate, in time of war, as a double diſadvantage to this country. Suppoſing us, for inſtance, to loſe as much of our former trade as employed fifteen thouſand ſeamen, and France and Spain to get one third of that which we loſe, this conſequence would unavoidably follow, namely, that the number of ſeamen employed in our private ſervices in time of peace, when compared with thoſe of the Houſe of Bourbon, would be leſs than they formerly were by *twenty thouſand*. This reaſoning, Sir, is ſo clear and concluſive on the ſubject, that you will, I flatter myſelf, be utterly incapable of effecting a refutation. That the American Trade-bill was founded upon principles that would have proved very beneficial to the United States, I readily admit; but I cannot conceive it poſſible for you to prove, that, had it paſſed into a law, it would "have tended in its "conſequences, not to the injury of our trade and "navigation, as was apprehended, but, in a very "eminent degree, to the ſupport and encouragement of both." Here, Sir, I think it incumbent on me to own, that you are not the only one who has uſed ſuch kind of argument. We have often been told, that the ſeparating and diſperſing of the ſhips which compoſed a certain fleet, was a proper mode of connecting that fleet; that the ſevering of our ſiſter kingdom from this country for ever, was the only way to effect a more *cloſe* and

permanent union with that kingdom; and now we are told, that the ſureſt way to *increaſe* our commerce, our ſhipping and our ſeamen, is to *give up*, liberally and magnanimouſly, a very conſiderable part of our trade, to the alien States of America! Theſe, Sir, and ſuch like aſſertions, may probably be conſiſtent with the rules of modern *patriotiſm*, and they may ſerve the purpoſe of an unprincipled party; but they are ſoleciſms in argument, repugnant to common ſenſe, and, in their conſequences, ſubverſive of the true intereſt of our country.

In the next paragraph you *modeſtly* tell us, that you will not preſume haſtily to condemn the meaſure which was adopted in the place of the American Trade-bill. "I allude (ſay you) to the act "which empowers his Majeſty in council to regu- "late the trade with America in ſuch a manner as "ſhall be thought moſt expedient and ſalutary. "It ſeemed not unreaſonable, it muſt be owned, "that ſome engagement ſhould be required, on "the part of America, in return for certain indul- "gences, which ſhe will probably expect from "Great Britain; and I take for granted that "conſiderarions of this nature induced Parliament "to veſt a diſcretionary authority in the Privy "Council."

That ſome engagement ſhould be required on the part of America, in return for *certain* indulgences which ſhe may probably expect from Great Britain,

Britain, ſeems highly reaſonable; but pray, Sir, allow me to aſk, What right have the United States of America to expect certain indulgences from Great Britain? And what ſecurity could the latter have for the true performance of any engagement on the part of the former? We know that the Americans, in every inſtance where their apparent intereſt laid them under any conſiderable degree of temptation, have proved exceedingly deceiful and perfidious to this country. Were Great Britain to grant *any* indulgences to America, they would doubtleſs be *certain* indulgences, becauſe ſhe had granted them; but we have every reaſon to believe, that the United States of America would not regard their engagements with us, any farther than the powerful motive of ſelf-intereſt induced to the performance. Some perhaps will ſay, that the former behaviour of the Americans toward this country, can afford no certain rule for us to judge of their future conduct; that they are "now a great and indepen-" dent nation," and muſt ſee it their intereſt, as well as honour, to ſupport their national character. Even ſuppoſing that the Americans were in their future tranſactions, to become more careful to preſerve their public honour, yet Great Britain might nevertheleſs doubt, whether ſuch a neceſſary reformation in their public conduct would be ſuffered to materially affect their engagements with her: and ſuppoſing it were fully proved that they are heartily diſpoſed to enter into a commercial treaty with

with Great Britain, on the principles of real reciprocity, it would ſtill be neceſſary for us to aſk, What have the United States of America to give, in return for thoſe *certain* indulgences which you ſay ſhe will probably expect to receive from this country? In the preſent ſituation of things, Sir, it is fair for me to ſuppoſe, that the Americans have nothing to give, unleſs it be ſuch articles as France, Spain, Portugal, and Holland, have previouſly refuſed; on account of their being deemed either improper for their markets, or too worthleſs for their acceptance.

I readily grant, Sir, that the intercourſe and reciprocal exchange of commodities which formerly ſubſiſted, between our fellow-ſubjects in the Weſt India Iſlands and thoſe of the now United States of North America, was of ſo beneficial a nature to all concerned, as to claim the moſt unbounded encouragement from Great Britain. At that time the parties ſtood equally related to us, and it was clearly our intereſt, as well as our duty, to encourage and protect both; but the bonds of union, between Great Britain and her late colonies, having been wholly diſſolved by the late treaty of peace, they ought now to be conſidered, not only as alien, but as rival ſtates: their alliance with France has placed them in the moſt unfavourable ſituation, reſpecting the Britiſh Empire, and rendered it highly neceſſary for us to do every thing in our power to prevent their becoming formidable. With reſpect to our

Weſt

Weſt India Iſlands, they are ſtill part of the Britiſh Empire, and their inhabitants, by continuing to profeſs due allegiance to their lawful Sovereign, are entitled to our utmoſt exertions in their behalf. I admit, Sir, that the grand objects of the Weſt India planters, in their trade with the Americans, were, the obtaining of food for the hungry, materials for their buildings, and packages for the conveying of their ſtaples to Great Britain: but I flatly deny that, without ſuch ſuſtenance, the inhabitants of thoſe iſlands muſt have unavoidably ſuffered the miſeries of famine; or that, without their materials for buildings and packages, the whole of the *immenſe* cultivations of our Weſt India Iſlands muſt have ſtopped. I freely admit, however, that no man, in the full poſſeſſion of his reaſon, will raiſe, at a great expence, commodities which he can neither conſume nimſelf, nor ſell to others. I think I am ſufficiently warranted to ſay, that Great Britain, Ireland, Canada, and Nova Scotia, can well ſupply all our Weſt India Iſlands with proviſions and lumber; and, ſuppoſing the price of the ſeveral articles to be higher than they formerly were, the price of the planter's produce will riſe in proportion, and the burthen muſt fall ultimately upon the conſumers of that produce.

" It were eaſy to demonſtrate (ſay you) the im-
" poſſibility of Britiſh ſhips ſupplying excluſively
" the ſugar Iſlands with American cargoes, except
" on terms ruinous either to the merchant who

" carries

" carries on the trade, or to the planter." But inſtead of attempting any thing, like a demonſtration, you add: " To thoſe who are acquainted " with the nature and comparative cheapneſs " of American navigation, proof of this is unneceſſary; and it is equally unneceſſary to thoſe " who are not: for in my opinion, the United " States will cut the matter ſhort by a reciprocal " reſtriction towards Britiſh ſhips." Whatever the Americans may do, Sir, you have thought proper to cut the *demonſtrable* matter very ſhort indeed. But, as I differ widely from you in opinion upon the ſubject, I take leave to ſay, that you will not only find it difficult, inſtead of eaſy, but even impoſſible to demonſtrate, " the impoſſibility " of Britiſh ſhips ſupplying excluſively the ſugar " iſlands with American cargoes, except on terms " ruinous either to the merchant who carries on " the trade, or to the planter." As the articles of importation (proviſions and lumber) are abſolutely neceſſary to the Weſt India Iſlands, they will generally yield a living profit to the importers, except when the markets become glutted by too great an influx; and as the demand for ſuch neceſſary articles will be general in all the iſlands, the expence attending the importation will alſo be general, and muſt fall ultimately upon the conſumers of their produce. The nature of the navigation, between America and the Weſt Indies, will be exactly the ſame to Britiſh ſhips as to thoſe of America;

America; and the expence, attending each, will be nearly equal. But ſuppoſing it otherwiſe, whatever advantages American ſhips can be ſuppoſed to have over thoſe of Britain, we muſt alſo ſuppoſe to attend ſhips belonging to our remaining colonies; and, conſequently, ſuch a mode of carrying on the intercourſe would obviate every difficulty that can be ſuppoſed to attend Britiſh ſhips, and prevent any *extra* expence to the planter. Having gone thus far, Sir, on the ſuppoſition that American ſhips will be navigated cheaper than Britiſh, I think it incumbent on me to ſay, that the balance will be in favour of the Britiſh ſhips, in point of cheapneſs. Thoſe which continue trading between America and the Weſt Indies will be nearly at the ſame expence as the Americans, excepting in the article of wages, which will be conſiderably lower. Thoſe ſhips which make the round from Britain to America, and thence to the Weſt Indies, will be ſomewhat higher in the article of proviſions, between Great Britain and America, but that *extra* expence will be more than counterbalanced by the advantage they will reap in the purchaſe of their ſhip's materials, ſeveral of which are cheaper here than in America.

But you are of opinion, that the United States will cut the matter ſhort, by a reciprocal reſtriction towards Britiſh veſſels; and you ground your opinion on the following circumſtances: "Firſt, "(ſay you) becauſe they well know, that Great

" Britain muſt in time recede; for America has " this advantage in the conteſt, that ſugar, and " rum, and coffee, and molaſſes, though very " wholeſome things, are not, however, like Ame- " rican proviſions, abſolutely neceſſary to the pre- " ſervation of life. Secondly, becauſe if they " are not permitted to purchaſe thoſe commodi- " ties of us in their own way, they can get them " elſewhere."

Although the produce of the Weſt India Iſlands may juſtly be ranked among the comforts of life, and although cuſtom has, in a great meaſure, placed them even among the neceſſaries of life, I freely grant that they are not, like proviſions, abſolutely neceſſary to its preſervation. As we muſt ſuppoſe the Americans to be as anxious as our Weſt Indian planters to diſpoſe of their produce, it may naturally be concluded, that a regard for their own intereſt will induce them to give the preference to that market where they can obtain the beſt price. To this, however, you raiſe an objection. In page 12th, you ſay: " Thoſe who " contend that the neceſſities of America will " oblige her to ſend her merchandiſe to the beſt " market, through any channel, appear to me to " judge ſomewhat haſtily of human nature. They " take for granted that intereſt has, in all caſes, " an irreſiſtible influence on human action. I " doubt this is not *always* a juſt concluſion. The " bulk of mankind are, I believe, as commonly

" governed

" governed by *paſſion.*" In anſwer to this, Sir, I would briefly obſerve, that the neceſſities of America will ſtrongly *induce*, if not oblige her, to ſend her merchandiſe to the beſt market, through the beſt channel that ſhe can. Intereſt certainly has, in moſt caſes, an almoſt irreſiſtible influence on human actions. Although paſſion frequently oppoſes ſelf-intereſt, it rarely prevails, eſpecially in communities; and, when it does happen to become predominant, it ſeldom or never maintains its aſcendency for any conſiderable length of time. The caſe of Queen Elizabeth and the Princeſs of Parma, which you have thought proper to quote, as a proof of the gratification of paſſion and revenge in the latter, at the expence of intereſt, is at beſt but an inſtance of *womanly reſentment.*

In page 13th you tell us, that the commercial intercourſe between America and our Weſt India Iſlands is not well underſtood, and you ground your aſſertion on the reaſoning of many diſtinguiſhed men, both in and out of Parliament, whoſe arguments prove them to be moſt ſtrangely miſinformed in a matter of the higheſt importance. " Among other poſitions (ſay you) which have " ſeemingly had an influence on the councils of " government in this buſineſs, it has been very " confidently urged, Firſt, that if the United " States ſhall refuſe permiſſion to the Britiſh ſhips " to carry on the trade between the Weſt Indies " and America excluſively, the planters may ob-

" tain ſufficient ſupplies of proviſions and lum-
" ber from Canada and Nova Scotia, at leaſt with
" ſome aſſiſtance from Great Britain.—Secondly;
" that Great Britain being entitled to the mono-
" poly of the produce of her own Weſt India
" Iſlands, it will be injurious to her intereſt to
" permit a direct importation into the United
" States of any part thereof in American veſſels.
" —Thirdly; that if the Americans are allowed
" a free commercial intercourſe with this king-
" dom and its dependencies as formerly, they will
" ſoon ſubſtantially enjoy it, to the excluſion of
" our own ſhipping, and the entire loſs of the
" carrying-trade.—Fourthly; that Ireland will
" have juſt reaſon to complain, if America is per-
" mitted to purchaſe ſugar and rum cheaper
" than herſelf.—I ſhall conſider (ſay you) theſe
" poſitions ſeparately: but in this, as in all other
" commercial diſquiſitions, it is the firſt duty of
" a writer to *aſcertain facts*. Declamation may
" miſlead, and ſpeculative reaſoning perplex, but
" in matters of trade, the moſt plauſible theory,
" unleſs it be raiſed on the ſolid evidence of well
" authenticated facts, is built on ſtubble."

I now proceed, Sir, to examine what you have ſaid, in order to obviate the foregoing objections; and whilſt I examine whether you have cloſely adhered to that which you ſay is the firſt duty of a writer, namely, the *aſcertaining of facts*, I hope that I ſhall, throughout the important diſcuſſion, pay a ſtrict regard to it myſelf.

In

In pages 15 and 16 you exhibit an enumeration of the different articles of importation from America, on an average of three years, viz. thoſe of 1771, 1772, and 1773. From thoſe provinces, which now conſtitute the United States, you ſay, our Weſt India Iſlands received "an annual ſupply "of one hundred and twenty-five thouſand barrels "of flour, five thouſand tierces of biſcuit, four-"teen thouſand tierces of rice, twelve thouſand "five hundred barrels of pork and beef, three "hundred and ſixty thouſand buſhels of Indian "corn; beſides beans, and peaſe, oats, &c. but "above all, as being of infinite importance to-"wards the maintenance of the Negroes, was the "article of ſalted fiſh, amounting to one hun-"dred and fifty thouſand quintals and thirty "thouſand barrels. Such was the proviſions, not "matters of luxury, but plain and neceſſary food. "Of lumber for building, ſuch as joints, boards, "planks, &c. (worth in the Weſt Indies before "the war about 5 l. ſterling per thouſand) the "quantity imported was twenty millions one hun-"dred and fifty thouſand feet, beſides twenty-"one millions of ſhingles for roofing; and of ſtaves "for hogſheads and puncheons, worth 8 l. ſterling "per thouſand, or thereabouts, the iſlands re-"ceived twenty-one millions one hundred and "ſixty thouſand, excluſive of ſeventeen thouſand "ſhook hogſheads, and about a million and a "half of wood-hoops. To all which are to be

"added,

" added, frames for houſes; ſpermaceti candles,
" iron, tar, turpentine, and lamp-oil; horſes,
" oxen, ſheep, and poultry; the whole annual
" importation, I venture to ſet, on the moſt mo-
" derate eſtimate, at the ſum of 750,000 l. ſterling
" money of Great Britain."

In return, you tell us, the Americans received annually of our planters, the following articles, viz. rum 3,600,000 gallons, at 1 s. 6 d. per gallon, 270,000 pounds; ſugar 3000 hogſheads, 1500 tierces, and 4000 barrels, worth 125,000 pounds; molaſſes 150,000 gallons, worth 5000 pounds; coffee, valued at 50,000 pounds; cocoa or chocolate, mahogany planks, about 10,000; piemento, ginger, cotton-wool, fuſtic, logwood, and lignum-vitæ, valued together at 60,000 pounds. The whole of the exportation amounting only to 510,000 pounds, the remaining 240,000 pounds, being the annual balance in favour of America, was paid, you ſay, in caſh and bills of exchange. Part of this balance was ſuppoſed to have been laid out in the purchaſe of molaſſes and coffee in the French Iſlands; but you ſuppoſe that the whole, or the greateſt part of it, was remitted by the Americans to Great Britain, in reduction of their debts to the Britiſh merchants. " And thus,
" (ſay you) *were once* the happy effects of colonial
" navigation and commerce! Though ſpreading
" through a variety of diſtant channels, their pro-

" fits

" fits all returned to, and ultimately concentered " in Great Britain, like rivers to the ocean."

As I do not think myſelf qualified to determine, whether or not the imports and exports have been ſo great as you have thought proper to ſtate them, I ſhall, for the preſent, admit, that your accounts are juſt. Having thus far agreed, I take leave to ſay, I am far from believing that *all* the profits of the Americans, in their trade with our Weſt India Iſlands, returned to, and ultimately concentered in, Great Britain. We know, Sir, that the Americans, though they claimed every privilege, denied all their obligations as Britiſh ſubjects, and, after repeatedly pleading their inability to alleviate that heavy burthen with which Great Britain had chearfully loaded herſelf on their account, they boaſted of their ability, and declared their reſolution to contend with her in arms.

In page 21, you ſay, " In truth it is the know- " ledge of the magnitude of the imports from the " United States, (ſeven hundred and fifty thou- " ſand pounds ſterling laid out in ſuch cheap and " bulky commodities as proviſions and lum- " ber!—) that chiefly demonſtrates the mockery " of referring the diſappointed planter to Canada " and Nova Scotia." But ſurely, Sir, no ſuch concluſion can juſtly be deduced from the premiſes. The knowing that our Weſt India Iſlands require an annual ſupply of the *cheap* and *bulky* articles of proviſion and lumber, cannot afford the

the leaſt ſhadow of a demonſtration, that the referring of our planters to Canada and Nova Scotia for ſuch ſupply is mockery; but it clearly demonſtrates thoſe motives which induced the Americans, and their factious friends here, to ſtrive ſo anxiouſly to engroſs ſuch an important trade. When you mention the *cheapneſs* and the *bulkineſs* of the annual ſupply from America, to the amount of 750,000 pounds, as an objection, you muſt know that Britiſh ſhips are to be the carriers, and that we are well able to furniſh a ſufficient number for that important purpoſe. We have a great many ſhips and ſeamen now wanting employ, and it is highly incumbent on our government to give them every poſſible encouragement. The Americans ſee the neceſſity of increaſing their ſhipping and ſeamen, and therefore they are anxious to acquire trade in their own bottoms, as the only means of accompliſhing that important purpoſe. Whether we ought to *aſſiſt* or *oppoſe* the United States, in the execution of their grand ſcheme for raiſing a reſpectable naval force upon the ruins of that of Britain, is humbly ſubmitted to the ſerious conſideration of every impartial reader. As a further *demonſtration* of the mockery of referring the diſappointed planter to Canada and Nova Scotia for ſupplies of proviſions and lumber, you ſay, "Even "if nature had not, as unfortunately ſhe has, ſhut "up the navigation from the former of theſe pro-"vinces ſix months in the year, and devoted the

"other

" other to everlaſting ſterility; there is this plain " reaſon in the nature of things that forbids the " planter to look to thoſe countries for effectual " relief. It is inconſiſtent with the nature of " commerce, to furniſh an adequate ſupply to ſo " vaſt and ſo various a demand; coming imme- " diately and unexpectedly. The demand and " the ſupply muſt grow up together, mutually " ſupporting, and ſupported by, each other. It " will require a long ſeries of years to bring them " to a level."

That nature has ſhut up the navigation of Canada for about ſix months in the year, I freely admit; but, that ſhe has devoted the province of Nova Scotia to everlaſting ſterility, I flatly deny. The demand for proviſions and lumber from thoſe provinces, for the ſupply of our Weſt India Iſlands, has come neither immediately, nor unexpectedly; the demand and the ſupply have been growing up together for ſome years paſt, and therefore, it will *not* require a long ſeries of years to bring them to a level; eſpecially when we conſider the great number of loyaliſts lately ſettled in the two colonies, who are juſtly entitled to the encouragement and protection of this country; and who will thereby be enabled to proceed rapidly in every neceſſary improvement. But you ſay, the principle, before ſtated, applies too, in a great degree, as well to England as to our few remaining colonies in North America.

" I will ſuppoſe, however, (ſay you) that Great " Britain can actually furniſh the chief of thoſe ar- " ticles which the planters formerly obtained from " the United States, yet, it muſt be remembered, " that the price of them in Europe, from the ad- " ance of freight only, will at leaſt be doubled." In order, Sir, to try the truth of this aſſertion fairly, I ſhall compare the price of the different articles with the freight on each. The price of beech-ſtaves for ſugar-hogſheads is 8 l. per thou-thouſand, and the freight 4 l. 7 s. 6 d. Oak-ſtaves for rum puncheons 15 l. per thouſand, freight 4 l. Hambro' double-ſtaves 25 l. per thouſand, freight 7 l. 10 s. Oats, three quarters, at 18 ſhillings per quarter, with the hogſhead at 12 ſhillings, is 3 l. 8 s. freight 19 ſhillings. Beans, three quarters, at 25 s. per quarter, with hogſhead, is 4 l. 7 s. freight 19 ſhillings. Biſcuit 5 cwt. at 15 ſhillings per cwt. with the hogſhead, is 4 l. 7 s. freight 19 ſhillings. Flour two cwt. at 13 s. per cwt. with barrel at 2 s. is 1 l. 8 s. freight 6 s. 6 d. Beef from Ireland 1 l. 15 s. per barrel, freight 5 s. Pork per barrel 2 l. freight 5 s. Thus it appears, that the freight of the different articles is in proportion to their ſeveral prices nearly as follows, viz. beech-ſtaves for ſugar-hogſheads, one-half; oak-ſtaves for rum-puncheons, one-fourth; Hambro' double-ſtaves, one-third; hogſhead and puncheon-packs, one fourth; oats, beans, biſcuit, and flour, one-fourth; beef from Ireland, one-ſeventh; and pork from ditto, one-eighth. Hence, Sir, it is evident, that you

" have

have erred exceedingly in ſaying, "That the price "of them in Europe, from the advance of freight "only, will at leaſt be doubled." Even beech-ſtaves, which is the loweſt article of the whole, pays little more than one-half of their prime coſt for freight. You will obſerve, Sir, that I have rated the articles of proviſion much lower than they are now; and ſtated the freight as they now ſtand upon the printed liſt in the Jamaica Coffee-houſe. Had I taken the preſent prices of flour and grain, the freight would have been conſiderably leſs than *one-fourth of the value*, and would conſequently militate more forcibly againſt ſeveral of your *aſcertained facts*.

Although our Weſt India planters may in ſome degree ſuffer, by the prohibiting of their intercourſe with the United States of America, I am of opinion, that they will not be very materially injured by it, at leaſt for any length of time. If the American trader could afford to pay liberally for our Weſt India produce, becauſe he dealt on barter, and for an homeward freight, is it not reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that the caſe will be nearly the ſame with thoſe who ſhall in future ſupply the ſugar planters with ſuch lumber and proviſions as may be wanted? The Britiſh market is, I believe, the higheſt in Europe for Weſt India produce; and, inſtead of being glutted, we have often experienced either a real or an artificial ſcarcity, even at times when ſugar and rum were at an exorbitant price. However enormous our duties may be

deemed, they are certainly paid by the conſumers; and the worſt that can thereby happen to the planter is, the leſſening of the conſumption. As to that part of his ſtaple commodities which you ſay muſt remain a dead loſs on the planter's hands, unleſs he can ſell it to America, I would juſt obſerve, that our remaining colonies will, in future, take a much greater quantity of rum than they formerly did, and that, were the planters to rediſtil the remainder of that which you ſay is fit only for the American market, it would fetch about two ſhillings per gallon in ours; which price, with the ſavings in the articles of freight and puncheons, would yield nearly as much profit as the other. After ſaying that part of the planter's produce muſt remain a dead loſs on his hands, you add, "It is therefore cruelty and inſult to tell "him of ſupplies in Great Britain, if he has not "wherewithal to purchaſe them. There may be "corn in Egypt, but there is no money in the "ſack's mouth." Can that, Sir, be deemed a *well authenticated fact?* or is it mere declamation, calculated to miſlead your honeſt, but incautious readers? By what rule of reaſoning can the telling of the Weſt India planter, that there are ſupplies in Great Britain, be called *cruelty* and *inſult?* Becauſe, ſay you, though there may be corn in Egypt, there is no money in the ſack's mouth! Here, Sir, you ſeem to have quite forgot your obſervation on

the

the neceſſity of obtaining materials for the package of their principal commodities, ſugar and rum. In page 9, you tell us, " That the quantity of " thoſe articles annually ſhipped to Great Britain " exceeds in value the ſum of three millions of " pounds ſterling." Surely, Sir, an annual ſum of more than three millions ſterling may be deemed *ſome* money in the ſack's mouth, when the corn in Egypt is to be purchaſed: but whether any thing, ſhort of a free intercourſe with the United States of America, will prove ſatisfactory to our Weſt India ſugar planters, and their *patriotic* friends here, I ſhall not, at preſent, take upon me to determine.

In page 23, you add, " Under circumſtances " of ſuch accumulated diſtreſs, it is abſolutely im- " poſſible that nineteen out of twenty of the plant- " ers can ſubſiſt:" but I take leave, Sir, to ſay, that this is far from being an *aſcertained* fact. Although the planters may, for a little while, experience *ſome* inconveniences, and ſuſtain *ſome* loſs, ſuch diſagreeable circumſtances will continually decreaſe, in proportion as the now well-peopled provinces of Canada and Nova Scotia proceed in their improvements; and they will, in the mean time, fall chiefly, if not wholly, on the conſumers of our Weſt India produce. Here, Sir, I think it neceſſary to obſerve, that the quantities of ſugar and rum exported annually to America, bore but a ſmall proportion to thoſe which were

ſhipped

ſhipped for Great Britain. You value the former at 395,000 pounds ſterling, and the latter at more than 3,000,000 ſterling. Hence it appears, from your own ſhewing, that our Weſt India planters exported only about a *ninth part* of their ſugar and rum to the thirteen colonies, now the United States of America; and the remaining *eight parts* to the Britiſh market. I readily admit that they obtained ſome American ſupplies, during the war, by means of the prize-veſſels which were condemned and ſold in their ports; and that the advanced price of Weſt India produce, at the Britiſh market, enabled them to purchaſe ſuch articles of Great Britain as ſhe could ſupply: but I am inclined to think that, after the ſupplies which were intercepted by the enemy are deducted from thoſe obtained by our prize-veſſels, the ſurplus of the latter will not be very conſiderable. Here it may not be improper to obſerve, that as the additional expences of our planters, in the courſe of the late war, were amply compenſated by the advanced price of their produce in the Britiſh market, they have good reaſon to hope, that a ſufficiency of ability to bear every future burthen will be derived from the ſame ſource. As great quantities of prize-ſugar, worth 70 ſhillings per cwt. for home conſumption, were ſold during the late war, at 56 ſhillings for exportation, it may be aſked, what, but an ardent zeal to promote the welfare of our Weſt India Iſlands, could have induced

duced the Britiſh Parliament to refuſe permiſſion to ſell prize-ſugars for home conſumption, when the price of that article had riſen no leſs than five pence per pound, and lump-ſugar was ſelling at a ſhilling.

In order to ſhew on what terms the planters were uſually ſupplied from Britain, with thoſe commodities which they formerly obtained from North America, you ſay, " Among other neceſſaries, " *flour* and *packages for rum*, conſtituted two im- " portant articles; of the flour a third, at leaſt, " periſhed before it reached its place of deſtina- " tion; and with regard to puncheons for con- " taining rum, it is to be obſerved, that pipe- " ſtaves from the Baltick, though affording the " neceſſary material, are not prepared for the uſe " of the Weſt Indies; being too long for a ſingle " puncheon, and not long enough for two; nei- " ther are they properly manufactured in other re- " ſpects. The planter was compelled therefore to " purchaſe ready made puncheons in Great Bri- " tain; the average price of which, during the " war, was about twenty ſhillings each, to which " add ſix ſhillings for freight, inſurance, and " charges, and the whole expence on the delivery " in the Weſt Indies, excluſive of the iron-hoops, " was 26 ſhillings.——Now the whole coſt in the " Weſt Indies, of the ſame article, prepared from " American ſtaves, was uſually about 11 s. only. " —Some part of this expence, however, was re-

" paid;

" paid; but it is no exaggeration to aver, that in " this inſtance alone, trifling as it may appear, by " importing their rum-packages from Great Bri- " tain inſtead of America, the iſlands ſuſtained a " loſs of at leaſt 50,000 l. ſterling."

With reſpect to the flour, Sir, I briefly obſerve, that the loſs which happened on that article was not owing to any inability in Great Britain to furniſh ſuch an article to her Weſt India Iſlands, but ſolely to the improper behaviour of the contractors. It is neceſſary that flour ſhould be kiln-dried, previous to its going into warm climates; and as it is difficult to know, from its ſubſequent appearance, whether or not it has wholly undergone that neceſſary operation, diſhoneſt men frequently mix flour, which has not been kiln-dried, with that which has, to the great prejudice of the whole. In the caſe now under conſideration it is ſuſpected, by thoſe who are judges, that a quantity of *thirds*, which never will keep good in hot climates, was mixed with the kiln-dried flour; however that might be, the fact certainly was, that a great deal of the flour did periſh, or became unfit for uſe, on or before its arrival in the Weſt Indies.

In my opinion, Sir, it will not be eaſy to conceive, how you came to think of *pipe-ſtaves* for the conſtruction of rum-puncheons. You either knew, or ought to have known, that rum-puncheon-ſtaves can eaſily be obtained in any quantity, conſequently

ſequently the purchaſing of pipe-ſtaves for the making of rum-puncheons, muſt be deemed, to ſay the leaſt, extremely imprudent. But you ſay, the ſending of pipe-ſtaves to the Weſt-Indies, compelled the planters to purchaſe ready made puncheons in Great Britain; and, what is ſtill more diſtreſſing, it appears, by your ſtatement of the prices, that ſuch puncheons coſt almoſt *three times* as much as thoſe which were made in the Weſt Indies from American ſtaves; I find that the average price of London puncheons, during the war, was about twenty ſhillings each; but then it ought to be obſerved, that ſuch puncheons were completely hooped; and captains who carried them out with biſcuit or grain, thought them pretty well ſold at 25 ſhillings each. Not to mention the unfairneſs of comparing the war-price of puncheons from Britain with the peace-price of thoſe that were made of American ſtaves in the Weſt Indies; you have rated the former too high, and the latter too low. I am credibly informed, that puncheons made of American ſtaves in the Weſt Indies will not coſt leſs, on an average, than 19 ſhillings each; and I have authority to ſay, that, by the time the next ſhips ſail, puncheons in packs may be bought for eleven ſhillings, ready money, to which, if 3 s. for freight, 4 s. for ſetting up, and 6 s. for iron-hoops, be added, the whole expence in the Weſt Indies, including one ſhilling for inſurance and other charges, will be 25 s. each;

which is 6 s. more than thoſe made from the American ſtaves, and would occaſion an *extra* expence, ſuppoſing all their puncheons (fifty thouſand) to be of the ſame manufacture, of 15,000 pounds annually. But puncheons made of Hambro' ſtaves in the Weſt Indies would coſt about 21 s. each, which is only 2 s. more than thoſe made from American ſtaves. Hence, Sir, ſome judgment may be formed, of that dependence which even the *meaneſt* of the Weſt India planters can ſafely place on the Mother Country for the ſupply of neceſſaries. That reſource is far, very far from being, as you have thought proper to ſay, *ruinous in the extreme.*

In your next paragraph you admit, " That " Great Britain is of right entitled to the mono- " poly of the produce of her Weſt India poſſeſ- " ſions as long as ſhe continues to them the " monopoly of her market." I truſt, Sir, you will alſo admit, that Great Britain has not only continued to our Weſt India planters the monopoly of her markets, but even more; ſhe has allowed large drawbacks on the exportation of two articles, namely, ſugar and rum. You contend, however, that a vent in America of thoſe articles of our Weſt India produce, for which the demand in Britain ſeldom afforded a ſaving price, may very reaſonably be expected.—" For not tending in the " ſmalleſt degree (ſay you) to the prejudice of the " Mother Country, it cannot ſurely be conſider-

" ed

" ed as a breach of that convention which I have
" ſuppoſed to ſubſiſt between her and her chil-
" dren. It were, indeed, ſtrange policy in a pa-
" rent ſtate to deprive her colonies of any reſource,
" the loſs of which, though an injury to them, is
" productive of no advantage to herſelf, nor can
" any contract warrant ſo extenſive an interpreta-
" tion."

Great Britain has no objection, Sir, to the carrying of the produce of our Weſt India Iſlands to America, provided that it be done by Britiſh ſhips, navigated by Britiſh ſeamen. But, if you mean that the trade ſhould be carried on by ſhips belonging to the United States of America, the requeſt is certainly unreaſonable in the extreme. Is it poſſible, Sir, that a conſiderable diminution can be made in our ſhipping and ſeamen, by admitting the Alien States of America to a participation in our Weſt India trade, without its tending, in the ſmalleſt degree, to the prejudice of the Mother Country? I freely admit, that it would be ſtrange policy in a parent ſtate to deprive her colonies of any material reſource which could not be productive of any conſiderable diſadvantage to herſelf. But to leſſen the number of her brave ſeamen, would be to weaken her naval force, and expoſe both her and her remaining colonies to inſult, depredation and conqueſt.

You proceed to ſhew, that a free exportation, to America, of the principalſtaple of the Weſt Indies, *ſugar*, ought to be allowed as formerly, even in

point of true policy on the part of Great Britain. You ſay, " It is inconteſtibly true, that if the " Americans are not permitted to purchaſe this " article from our own iſlands, they will obtain it " from thoſe of France." The Americans, Sir, will probably obtain ſugar *clandeſtinely*, both from our iſlands and thoſe of France; but ſurely that ſpecies of ſmuggling affords no ſolid reaſon for our granting the Alien States of America a free trade with our ſugar iſlands. Were clandeſtine trade, in any article, allowed to conſtitute an operative reaſon for laying ſuch trade entirely open, commercial prohibitions of every kind would probably ſoon come to an end, and trade in general become free to every adventurer. You ſay you believe what Lord Sheffield ſays, namely, " The difference of " price between French, Daniſh, and Dutch, and " Britiſh Weſt India ſugar, was ſo great, that " above two-thirds of the ſugar imported into " America came from the foreign iſlands;" and this, you add, " is a circumſtance of which " Great Britain ought certainly to avail herſelf, " by encouraging, as much as poſſible, the Ame- " ricans to deal with our own ſugar iſlands " for this article among others, inſtead of lay- " ing out their money with the French, the Danes " and the Dutch." Here, Sir, you ſeem to forget your principal argument in favour of a free intercourſe between our Weſt India Iſlands and the United States of America, namely, the neceſſity which you ſay the former are under of obtaining

proviſions

proviſions and lumber from the latter: under that idea, and in order to induce a belief that caſh and bills of exchange, paid in the Weſt Indies, found their way into the pocket of the Britiſh creditor, you ſuppoſe, in page 18, that much leſs of the 240,000 pounds ſterling (the annual balance in favour of America) was laid out in the French iſlands than is commonly imagined; "For the "French planters had (ſay you) as great occaſion "as our own for American lumber and neceſſa-"ries." Without pretending to know whether any of the caſh and bills, paid by our ſugar planters for proviſions and lumber, were remitted by the Americrns to their creditors here, I take leave to ſtate the following remark, namely, if the Americans, when it was clearly their duty to have taken the whole of their Weſt India articles from our planters, purchaſed no leſs than two-thirds of their ſugar at the foreign iſlands, ſurely we cannot ſuppoſe, that our quondam fellow-ſubjects, now independent, will prove *more* regardful of our intereſt. You ſay, "That every addition to the property "of our ſugar iſlands is abſolutely and entirely "an augmentation of the national wealth:" but experience contradicts your aſſertion. Were it univerſally admitted, that our legiſlature can as legally and eaſily put its hand into the pocket of our coloniſts, as into thoſe of Britons; and were we certain, that opulence and power have no tendency to produce ſelf-ſufficiency, inſolence and rebellion,

I ſhould

I ſhould not heſitate a moment in giving my full aſſent to your propoſition: but alas! the facts are very different indeed. The language frequently held in our Houſes of Parliament, and the behaviour of our Revolted Colonies, exhibit ſtriking proofs of my aſſertion, and they furniſh inſtructive and awful leſſons to this ſeemingly devoted country.

When you ventured to aſſert, in page 27, that no people on earth had received a greater ſhare of misfortunes from the hand of Omnipotence than our Weſt India planters, you forgot, I preſume, the miſerable inhabitants of that province which you had previouſly declared to have been devoted by Nature, or rather the God of Nature, to a ſtate of *everlaſting ſterility*. The truth, however, is, the Almighty hath often ſeen fit to viſit our Weſt India Iſlands with deſtructive hurricanes; and their inhabitants, when under the diſtreſſing effects of ſuch awful viſitations, have ever experienced the kind commiſeration, and generous aſſiſtance of their Parent State. After having expatiated on the attachment of our Weſt India planters to Great Britain, you aſk, "On what principle then of reaſon "or juſtice, are we called upon to deprive thoſe "colonies, thus attached to us by every tie of in-"tereſt and affection, of any one advantage in the "diſpoſal of their produce, which is not immedi-"ately prejudicial to ourſelves?' To this I readily anſwer, Sir, that Great Britain cannot, on any principle

principle of reaſon or juſtice, think of depriving her colonies of any advantage in the diſpoſal of their produce, which does not appear to be either *immediately* or *remotely* prejudicial to herſelf. But the truth is, *that* trade, for which you ſo ſtrenuouſly contend, would be both. It would immediately affect the manufactures of this country, and reduce our merchant-ſhipping; and conſequently it would materially diminiſh the naval force of the Britiſh Empire. "Are we by miſtaken prohibi-
"tions (ſay you) to compel their old cuſtomers the
"Americans, to deal with foreigners, whether they
"incline ſo to do or not?" You know, Sir, that foreigners were the old cuſtomers of the Americans as well as our Weſt India planters; or have you forgot that they purchaſed two-thirds of their ſugar from foreigners, at a time when the compulſory authority of the Mother Country was clearly intended to operate in a manner directly contrary to that which you now deprecate. "If the veſſels of
"the United States are freely admitted into our
"Weſt India ports, (ſay you) it is probable, in the
"aſſortment of their homeward freight, that ſugar
"will ſtill conſtitute *ſome part* of their cargoes. I
"believe in truth a ſmall part." Here, Sir, I find myſelf at a loſs to determine, whether your argument is moſt likely to promote, or prevent that free intercourſe for which you ſo ſtrenuouſly plead. The latter ſeems to be, in my opinion, the moſt natural effect: for who, in the name of wonder,

der, would chuſe to riſk ſo *much* in order to obtain that which is acknowledged to be a trifle. "But "whatever may be its amount (ſay you) the value "of it, if ſugar itſelf is prohibited, muſt be paid "in ready money, which will afterwards probably "find its way to thoſe plantations where a wiſer "policy prevails." In this ſentence, Sir, two things are implied; firſt, that our planters in the Weſt Indies will ſtand indebted to the Americans to the full amount of the value of the ſugar which the latter may want; and ſecondly, that there are plantations where they can, if refuſed in ours, obtain ſugar for their money. But the intercourſe is not yet admitted, conſequently our planters cannot become indebted to the American trader; and as to the wiſer policy of other plantations, I take leave to ſay, you have not attempted to prove that any ſuch policy exiſts.

In page 29, you ſay, "By permitting a di-"rect exportation of ſugar to America, ſhe "(Great Britain) will ſoon find a proportionate "increaſe of the ſame ſtaple at her own empo-"rium; while the conſumption of her manufac-"tures will enlarge with the augmentation of her "navigation and revenue." Pray, Sir, allow me to aſk, are theſe *aſcertained facts?* or ought the whole to be deemed a ſtrain of mere ſpeculative reaſoning, calculated to perplex, or miſlead, the judgment of your readers? A direct exportation of ſugar to America will ſoon produce a proportionate

increaſe of the ſame ſtaple at the Britiſh market; while the conſumption of our manufactures will enlarge with the augmentation of our navigation and revenues! What an important ſentence! It brings to my mind an anecdote of a man, who offered to produce a dozen of reaſons why his friend could not appear in court. "In the firſt place, "my Lord (ſaid he to the judge) he is dead."— "That is ſufficient (replied his Lordſhip) you may "ſpare yourſelf the trouble of producing the other "eleven." Unfortunately for your aſſertion, it carries no ſuch evidence along with it; if it did, every other argument in favour of that exportation, for which you contend, would be rendered unneceſſary. You tell us, indeed, that the improvements which were viſible in the iſland of Jamaica within the ſhort ſpace of fifteen years, previous to the late unfortunate war, eſtabliſh the truth of your reaſoning beyond all contradiction. But how do they eſtabliſh it? The improvements, you tell us, may be judged of by this, namely, "That in 1757 "the import of ſugar into the port of London, "from that iſland, was 24,494 hogſheads; in "1772, it had riſen to 45,889 hogſheads!" So much, Sir, for the proof of thoſe improvements which you ſay were viſible in the iſland of Jamaica in the ſhort ſpace of fifteen years. But how do you eſtabliſh, by that fact, the truth of your momentous reaſoning? "Let us now no longer be "told (ſay you) that an exportation of that com-

" modity to North America is prejudicial to the " revenues of Great Britain." This, Sir, is a ſtrange concluſion from the premiſes. From the year 1757 to that of 1772, the quantity of ſugar, exported from Jamaica to London, increaſed from 24,494 to 45,889 hogſheads; but does it therefore follow, that ſuch increaſe was owing to the free exportation of that article from Jamaica to America? It ſurely does not. The exportation was as free before the year 1757 as it was between that and 1772; and you admit, that the Americans had not, even at the latter period, above *one-third* of their ſugar from our iſlands. The increaſe is, in my opinion, to be attributed chiefly to thoſe improvements which have been progreſſively carried on by our ſugar planters; and to the increaſing demand for their produce at the Britiſh market. Sugar, from being a luxury, or at moſt but a wholeſome and comfortable article, is now become a neceſſary of life; and cuſtom is daily rendering the uſe of it more and more univerſal.

" I come now (ſay you) to the loudeſt of all the " objections that have yet been urged againſt the " eſtabliſhment of a liberal intercourſe with the " Americans; namely, the ſuppoſed danger of their " engroſſing the navigation and carrying-trade of " this kingdom; in which, however, it is ſufficient to obſerve, with reſpect to our ſugar colonies, that the argument whereon this objection " is founded (if I rightly comprehend its meaning)

" ing) takes for granted what yet remains to be " proved; ſince it implies, that the admiſſion of " American veſſels into our Weſt India ports " allows them alſo a *free trade from thence to Great* " *Britain.* But aſſuredly this does not neceſſarily " follow." I readily grant, Sir, that the implication which you ſtate does not neceſſarily follow. But, ſhould the Americans be permitted to trade with our Weſt India Iſlands at all, it is more than probable that they will ſoon get more than is barely neceſſary for the ſupply of each other's immediate wants. You ſay, that our Weſt India planters, impreſſed with the dread of impending evils, requeſt only, " that America may be permitted, " as formerly, to bring them food, and ſuch " other neceſſaries as Great Britain herſelf cannot " furniſh, and to receive in payment ſuch of their " ſtaples as Great Britain cannot conſume." Some may probably think this a very reaſonable requeſt: for my part I view it in a very different light. Although the United States of America have become aliens to Great Britain; and although they have been, and ſtill are, cloſely connected with our natural enemies, our Weſt India planters *modeſtly* requeſt, that their former connections and intercourſe with the Americans, now the allies of France, may be renewed. They only want permiſſion for their quondam fellow ſubjects to bring them food, and ſuch things as Great Britain cannot furniſh; and to receive, in return, ſuch of their

ſtaples as Great Britain cannot conſume. But what ſecurity, Sir, will our Weſt India planters give to their Parent State, that the trade between them and the United States of America ſhall not be carried to a much greater extent: ſhould their old cuſtomers, by way of accommodating their Weſt India friends, bring a proper aſſortment of foreign manufactures along with their *food* and other *neceſſaries*, would the planter refuſe ſuch manufactures, becauſe they would interfere with thoſe of his Mother Country? And ſuppoſing him to purchaſe them, would he heſitate a moment in making the payment in ſuch ſtaples as Great Britain could not only conſume, but even wanted, merely becauſe he apprehended that ſuch a ſale, or barter, would have a tendency to raiſe the price of them at her market? Few, I preſume, will venture to anſwer thoſe queries in the affirmative.

The Weſt India planters are told, ſay you, *that Canada and Nova Scotia ſhall ſupply their wants*; on which you venture to aſſert, "We have de-"monſtrated the folly of this expectation." Here, Sir, you omit a material part of the poſition; and you boaſt of a demonſtration, which, in fact, has no exiſtence. Canada and Nova Scotia, with *ſome temporary aſſiſtance from Britain*, can fully ſupply them.—Again, *Great Britain claims the monopoly of their produce*; on which you think proper to ſay, "It has been ſhewn, that ſhe will ſtill poſſeſs it to

"every

"every beneficial purpoſe." I admit, Sir, that you have ſaid ſo, but deny that you have ſhewn it. Should Great Britain allow the Americans a free trade with her Weſt India Iſlands, the idea of a continued monopoly to this country would be ridiculous in the extreme. Inſtead of continuing to poſſeſs that monopoly, to which we are juſtly entitled, we ſhould ſoon have the mortification to ſee our Weſt India planters joined in commercial intercourſe with every rival nation in Europe, through the medium of our former ſubjects, the now Alien States of America. Once more, *the Americans will engroſs the carrying-trade to the excluſion of our own ſhipping*. This objection, you tell us, is expreſſed in ſuch general terms, that you "really believe, many well-meaning men, who "have grown hoarſe in repeating it, have no pre-"ciſe idea of its meaning to this hour." Surely, Sir, men may entertain very different opinions on the ſubject, and yet the ideas of each be preciſe and determinate. "If the objection ſignifies (ſay "you) what I believe it was meant to ſignify by "ſome who uſed it in the Houſe of Commons in "the Debate on Mr. Pitt's Proviſional Bill, namely, "*that American ſhips, having diſcharged their car-*"*goes in our Weſt India Iſlands, will enter into a* "*competition with Britiſh veſſels loading there for* "*freight to Great Britain*, it is, I confeſs, a matter "deſerving conſideration; but Great Britain ſurely "may adminiſter a *preventive* leſs dangerous in its

"effects

" effects than the project of ſtarving her ſugar co-
" lonies, by interdicting all intercourſe whatever
" between them and the United States. The
" diſeaſe, in this caſe, is, indeed, by far the
" leſſer evil."

In your endeavours to obviate the laſt objection, you own that American ſhips becoming competitors with our ſhips in the Weſt Indies for freight to Britain, is a diſeaſe which deſerves condſideration: but, by imagining certain direful effects to flow from the propoſed preventive, you make the remedy appear to be even worſe than the diſeaſe itſelf. To allow the Americans to become competitors with us in our Weſt India Iſlands, for freight to Britain, would prove very diſtreſſing to individuals, and injurious to our navy; and, on the other hand, to *ſtarve* our ſugar colonies, would be ſhocking to humanity, and ruinous to our commerce. But is there no other alternative? We ſurely may ſtill monopolize the trade of our Weſt India Iſlands, without ſtarving their inhabitants; and we may grant as much privilege in trade to the Americans, as they can poſſibly return to Great Britain.

Reſpecting Ireland, in page 32, you ſay, " Ire-
" land has already received, as matter of right, all
" the freedom of trade which ſhe claimed, or can
" reaſonably deſire, and ſhe nobly earned it."
Although I am unwilling, Sir, to ſay much about Ireland at preſent, love for my country, and a

regard

regard for truth, require me to contradict your aſſertion. I am far from thinking that Ireland, in her preſent ſituation, has a right to that unbounded freedom of trade which has been granted her; nor can I believe, that ſhe nobly earned it. Ireland is now as diſtinct from, and independent of Great Britain as Hanover is; and ſhe cannot have any better claim, than that Electorate has, to a participation in the trade of our colonies. Ireland continued to haraſs the Britiſh government by repeated demands, when the greateſt cordiality between the two kingdoms, and the moſt vigorous exertions againſt the common enemy, were eſſentially neceſſary for the welfare of the Empire; and ſhe obtained grants, at a time, and in a manner, highly unworthy of her character as a brave and generous nation. You obſerve, that "when "the people of Ireland are told, *that they ought to* "*have Weſt India produce on as good terms as the* "*Americans, now a foreign nation,* the fact itſelf "is not fairly ſtated." To this, Sir, I readily ſubſcribe: for although I cannot approve of thoſe unlimited commercial privileges which have been granted to Ireland, or of the means by which they were obtained, I am perſuaded that the Iriſh ought to have Weſt India produce upon *better* terms than the Americans; becauſe the former are ſtill our fellow-ſubjects, whereas the latter can only be conſidered as aliens, and thoſe too of the very worſt deſcription. When I call the Iriſh fellow-ſubjects,

I only

I only mean ſubjects of one and the ſame Sovereign; for they are now wholly independent of this kingdom, and muſt in time become dangerous rivals in trade. Ireland, by the lowneſs of her taxes, and her vicinity to the Weſtern Ocean, will ſoon acquire ſuch a ſuperiority in commerce as muſt prove exceedingly hurtful to the manufactures and navigation of this kingdom. Great Britain, having reared and protected her colonies at a great expence, is juſtly intitled to the monopoly of their produce. Hence the right of Ireland is founded ſolely on the favour of Britain, and the ſame power that gave the right, can ſurely take it away. As the *privilege* and *obligation* of ſubjects ought to be, in all caſes, coextended, Ireland, with her free participation in our trade, ought alſo to take a ſhare of our national burthens. In ſhort, the two kingdoms ought, in future, to have *one* common cauſe to ſupport, *one* intereſt, and *one* purſe. Whether a *firm* and equitable union, between the two kingdoms, would bid the faireſt for promoting happineſs at home, and commanding reſpect abroad, is humbly ſubmitted to the ſerious conſideration of the *rulers* on both ſides of the water. That we are no longer at the expence of maintaining a fleet for the protection of the commerce of America, is true; but does it therefore follow, that the Americans, who are now foreigners, ſhould be allowed a free trade with our Weſt India Iſlands? or that they are equally entitled with

Ireland,

Ireland, to a participation of that trade? If ſuch an exemption, on our part, conveys ſuch a privilege to all thoſe who are the objects of it, we ſhall probably ſoon find a conſiderable increaſe in the number of claimants.

Whether you have "ſatisfactorily obviated the "principal objections and arguments that have "been eloquently urged, both in Parliament and "the preſs, againſt the revival of a commercial "intercourſe between our Weſt India Iſlands and "the United States of America, on terms of equal "freedom and advantage," let the impartial public judge. If declamation be deemed ſound argument, and confident aſſertions paſs for aſcertained facts, you doubtleſs have whereof to boaſt; but thoſe who reſt their aſſent to every propoſition, ſolely on that evidence which it carries along with it, may probably take the liberty to diſpute your claim.

After obſerving, that the navigation from Canada is obſtructed ſix months in the year by the ice, and that the hurricane months in the Weſt Indies occupy great part of the time in which the river Saint Lawrence is open, you ſay, "How caſual, "how uncertain, therefore, muſt be any ſupply "from thence for the uſe of the planters in the "Weſt Indies, even if Canada had people ſufficient to cut her lumber, and the means of preparing her wheat into flour fit for the Weſt "India market, neither of which advantage ſhe

" poſſeſſes at preſent." I freely admit the juſtneſs of your remarks concerning the navigation from Canada to the Weſt Indies, on account of the ice in the former, and the hurricanes in the latter; but ſurely, Sir, the ports of Nova Scotia may be ſtored with all the Canadian articles by ſmall veſſels in the ſummer ſeaſon; and they may afterwards be reſhipped for the Weſt Indies at pleaſure. As the hurricane ſeaſon is reckoned to end in the Weſt Indies by the middle of October, thoſe veſſels which leave the Gulph of St. Lawrence in the month of September, may proceed for either Nova Scotia or the Weſt Indies as they ſhall think proper. That Canada and Nova Scotia have lately received a great addition to the number of their inhabitants, by the ſettling of the Loyaliſts among them, is too notorious to be denied; and I am credibly informed, that great preparations have been going forward, for ſome time paſt, in both provinces, for the important purpoſe of ſupplying our Weſt India Iſlands with proviſions and lumber. In Canada, their annual quantity of grain is much increaſed, and a great number of excellent flour-mills have been erected; ſo that in all likelihood they will have more than ſufficient to ſupply our ſugar colonies with that neceſſary article. You doubt, indeed, " whether " Canada (as now bounded) furniſhes that ſpecies " of wood called *white oak*; the only material " proper for containing rum:" and you add, " it is certain that Nova Scotia does not." But I have

have the pleaſure, Sir, to reſolve your doubt, reſpecting Canada; and good authority to contradict your aſſertion concerning Nova Scotia. There is plenty of white oak in Canada, and a conſiderable quantity even in Nova Scotia; nevertheleſs it muſt be owned, that the greateſt quantity of that uſeful article grows in that part of Canada which was given to the American States by the late treaty of peace. Mr. Oſwald, and thoſe who appointed him, know beſt why it was cut off from our province, and given to the Alien States of America. I have often heard that Mr. Oſwald acknowledges, that, *without being ſolicited by the American agents*, he curtailed the province of Canada *ſolely through ignorance!* Although I cannot take upon me to contradict Mr. Oſwald's aſſertion, I am inclined to think, that he acted in ſtrict conformity to the will of his employers. Our curtailing negotiator certainly knew, that the limits of Canada were expreſſly fixed by an act of Parliament, and that it was his indiſpenſable duty to have adhered ſtrictly to thoſe boundaries which were particularly deſcribed in it; unleſs he was inſtructed to the contrary, by thoſe who acted as the directors of the negociation. For my part, I am perſuaded, that Mr. Oſwald would not have dared to break through an act of Parliament, in the manner which he did, without having the expreſs orders of his Majeſty's Miniſters to warrant his proceedings. *They* have been ſtrangely regardleſs of the welfare of their coun-

try; and *they* ſeem to have even vied with each other in promoting the intereſt of our enemies. When the treaty of peace was to be negociated, a merchant was employed; and, in order to ſettle a treaty of commerce, a politician was commiſſioned. However improper thoſe appointments may appear, reſpecting the particular buſineſs allotted to each negociator, one thing is worthy of obſervation, namely, that none were employed, in either of the important ſervices, but ſuch as had previouſly given evident proof of their attachment to the *American cauſe*. Mr. Oſwald, we were told, gave ſecurity for Mr. Laurens when he left the Tower; and Mr. Hartley always was, even in his parliamentary capacity, a ſtrenuous advocate for the Revolted Colonies. The French Gazette of June the 18th, 1779, under the article, *London News*, ſaid, "Mr. Hartley inſiſted, that the naval "force of France was almoſt equal to that of "Great Gritain both in Europe and America; "that Spain held the balance, and which-ever ſide "ſhe declared for would have the ſuperiority.— "He would dare to aſſert, that England would no "longer be miſtreſs of the ocean than it pleaſed "the Houſe of Bourbon to permit her." But we have the ſatisfaction to know by experience, that Mr. Hartley is no prophet. France and Spain made the trial, and yet Great Britain, in ſpite of Hartley and Bourbon, continued miſtreſs of the ocean. Some ſay that Mr. Hartley is now at Paris, negociating

cating a treaty of commerce with the American agents; but, for the ſake of my country, I wiſh the report to be groundleſs. The entering into any treaty, with independent America, muſt be prejudicial to this country; and, were it otherwiſe, prudence would ſurely direct to the choice of a very different negociator.

After taking notice of that miſerable ſituation into which many of the Weſt India planters were reduced, by the dreadful effects of the laſt hurricane, you ſay, that "America, in the very firſt "moment of reconciliation, haſtened to their re-"lief." Your words, Sir, ſeem to be expreſſive of compaſſion, on the part of America, and you appear anxious to induce your readers to believe that they were actuated by motives of pure humanity; but thoſe who are not quite blinded by prejudice will probably diſcover ſelf-intereſt at the bottom, and be apt to think, that the expedition of the American traders was ſolely owing to a deſire of meeting with a good market.

"It has been ſhewn, (ſay you) in the ſtate of "the impoſts from North America, that the ar-"ticle of ſalted fiſh (viz. cod, mackrel, and ſhad) "to the incredible amount of 150,000 quintals, "and 30,000 barrels, conſtituted part of their "annual conſumption. It grieves me to ſay, that "this, and herrings from Ireland, made the only "animal food of the poor Negroes. By the late "proclamation, the future import of ſalted fiſh

"from

" from the United States is not permitted *even in* " *Britiſh veſſels.* As it is impoſſible that Ireland " alone, or conjointly with the fiſheries of Saint " John's and Nova Scotia, in their preſent ſtate, " can ſupply the deficiency, infatuation muſt have " crept into our councils. Is it not enough that " ruin will overtake the unoffending planter?— " Muſt the moſt wretched of all the children of " affliction, his miſerable ſlaves, alſo fall victims " to your vengeace?"

Why 150,000 quintals, and 30,000 barrels of ſalted fiſh, imported annually into our Weſt India Iſlands, and ſtated in page 15 as an *aſcertained fact*, ſhould, in page 36, be called an *incredible* amount, is worthy of inquiry. In the former you expatiate on the quantity and value of the ſeveral articles imported annually into our Weſt India Iſlands, by thoſe colonies which now conſtitute the United States of America; in the latter you endeavour to impreſs ſuch an idea of the quantity, on the minds of your readers, as may induce them to believe, that all our fiſheries at Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, and Ireland, are utterly incapable of furniſhing it. The whole would load about *eighty* veſſels of 160 tons each; and I think myſelf fully warranted to ſay, that our fiſheries can eaſily furniſh a much greater quantity. When you mention the fiſheries of Saint John's and Nova Scotia in their *preſent ſtate*, do you recollect the many thouſands of Loyaliſts lately gone to reſide in thoſe

thoſe parts? And do you conſider the vaſt number of ſhips and ſeamen, now in Britain, wanting employment? Is it not enough, Sir, that the unoffending Loyaliſt has been driven from his former home and connexions, and forced to ſeek his future ſuſtenance in one of thoſe *ill-fated* provinces which you ſay is devoted to *everlaſting ſterility*, but he muſt be purſued, even there, by the unrelenting Aliens, and cruelly deprived of that livelihood which he thought of obtaining from the more prolific waters? This is not mere declamation, Sir, ſuch as that which you have thought fit to uſe, in pleading the cauſe of the unoffending ſugar planter and his miſerable ſlaves; it is ſound and ſerious reaſoning, on a matter wherein public juſtice is deeply intereſted, and which highly concerns the honour and welfare of the kingdom.

After ſpeaking in favour of the ſlave-trade from Africa, as a merchant or ſtockholder, you ſay, "As a man, and a Chriſtian, I hope I ſhall live "to ſee the day (though a ſugar planter myſelf) "when this abominable traffic will be prohibited. "I think I can clearly prove, that even the wel-"fare of the planter concurs, with the honour of "government, and the intereſt of humanity, in "wiſhing its total abolition." Here, Sir, you do yourſelf great honour, as a man, a ſugar planter, and a Chriſtian; and as you think you can clearly prove, that it is the intereſt even of the ſugar planter

planter to aboliſh that traffic, which is certainly a diſgrace to humanity, I wiſh you had favoured the public with the great outlines of your liberal and humane ſcheme. The emancipation of thoſe who are now in bondage, and the preventing of ſlavery in future, would promote the happineſs of thouſands of our fellow-creatures, and afford great pleaſure to all who now feel for the degradation of their ſpecies, and the diſhonour done to Chriſtianity, by the abominable practice of ſelling men, women, and children, as though they were an inferior rank of beings, and deſigned by their Creator for no nobler purpoſe than that of adminiſtering to the eaſe, emolument, and grandeur of their arrogant and unfeeling maſters.

" At preſent (ſay you) the ſyſtem of Great Bri-
" tain towards her few remaining colonies, is a
" ſyſtem unexampled in the annals of mankind.
" —It is war under the name of peace, againſt the
" moſt valuable of our plantations, who have not
" only given her no provocation, but whoſe wel-
" fare ſhe knows and acknowledges to be the ſup-
" port of her own Empire; well, therefore, may
" the planters complain, that *they are ſuffering*
" *without blame, and incurring all the effects of re-*
" *ſentment, without the ſlighteſt imputation on their*
" *obedience.*"

The ſituation in which Great Britain has placed herſelf, by the late ſhameful and injurious peace, is certainly unexampled in the annals of mankind; but

but I cannot admit that her *ſyſtem* towards her few remaining colonies comes under that deſcription. You boldly ſay, it is war, under the name of peace, againſt the moſt valuable of her plantations; but I take upon me, Sir, to deny your charge, and call upon you for proof. What ſyſtem of war is Great Britain now carrying on againſt her remaining colonies, under the name of peace? I err not when I ſay, that the Britiſh government has been, and now is, the mildeſt, without exception, that ever was upon earth. It has, in fact, been much too mild, Sir; it has ſubmitted tamely ſubmitted to the groſſeſt of inſults, from thoſe who were clearly within the reach of her power; and ſhe has ſuffered many capital delinquents to eſcape with impunity. The Americans, by their monſtrous ingratitude and ſucceſsful rebellion, have become Aliens to Britain, and highly cenſurable for their unnatural behaviour; but no man, I preſume, blames the *peaceable* and *loyal* inhabitants of our Weſt India Iſlands, for either the paſt or the preſent conduct of the Americans towards this country. I readily admit that, to deſtroy the innocent, becauſe their deſtruction may operate eventually as a puniſhment to the guilty, would be inconſiſtent with policy, religion and humanity. I alſo admit, that five hundred thouſand perſons ought not to be ſtarved; nor ought a property of ſixty millions ſterling to be rendered

unprofitable and precarious, merely to prevent the Alien States of America from getting the advantage of ſelling them food and neceſſaries: policy, religion, and humanity, ſurely reprobate the idea. Your queſtion implies either an actual or a deſigned guilt on the part of your country; but as no part of our conduct towards our Colonies can warrant ſuch an implication, I am really at a loſs to conceive, how it could enter into your mind. To *deſtroy* the innocent, becauſe their deſtruction *may* operate as a puniſhment to the guilty; and to *ſtarve* 500,000 perſons, and render 60 millions of property unprofitable and precarious, for no other purpoſe than that of preventing the Americans from reaping any advantage by carrying them ſuſtenance and neceſſaries, would be a line of conduct not only too bad for humane and generous Britain to follow, but much too ſhocking for the moſt cruel and barbarous nation upon earth. How you came to imagine Great Britain capable of ſuch egregious folly, conſummate injuſtice, and horrid cruelty, muſt be left for you to anſwer. Should our Weſt India planters take the alarm, and proceed to violent meaſures, or ſuch as may be deemed inconſiſtent with their duty as ſubjects, by way of reſiſting that ſyſtem of war which you ſay Great Britain is now carrying on againſt them, under the name of peace; and ſhould Britain, in order to maintain her juſt authority over her colonies, proceed to coerce them by a military force, you probably

bably may, when too late, think yourſelf in ſome degree accountable to God and your country for the conſequences.

In your concluding paragraph you ſay, "In pri-" vate life it is not the man who is injured, but he " that gives the injury, that ſeldom forgives. This, " however, is the peculiar characteriſtic of baſe " and ignoble minds; for ſuch only are guilty of " unprovoked and premeditated miſchief." Experience, I am ſorry to ſay, affords too ample proof, that the man who gives the injury ſeldom *ſubmits*, not to ſay forgives. If this is, indeed, the peculiar characteriſtic of baſe and ignoble minds, it follows, from the preceding ſentence, that men of a contrary diſpoſition are *ſeldom* to be met with; and that mankind are generally guilty of *unprovoked* and *premeditated* miſchief! " Miſtake, indeed, is the lot of our nature, (you " add) and the wiſeſt and greateſt of men are not " exempted from it; but conviction on ſuch " minds produces not malignity and revenge, " but acknowledgement and reparation." Upon this, Sir, I would briefly obſerve, that conviction on *any* mind cannot naturally produce malignity, however incapable it may often prove to eradicate, or even diminiſh, that which previouſly exiſted. As to *revenge*, it nevet can be ſuppoſed to exiſt, after a clear conviction of *miſtake* or error. " When " unretracted error (ſay you) hardens into obſti-" nacy, and diſappointed ambition is degraded

" into malice—Theſe are ſigns of a fatal degene-
" racy; of a conduct not merely erroneous, but
" proceeding from principles depraved and cor-
" rupt." To the truth of this ſentence, Sir, I freely ſubſcribe; and I am ſorry to add, that ſuch degeneracy and depravation but too generally appear in the tranſactions of the preſent day. You ſay, " It is with communities as with individuals.
" We were once a people renowned for genero-
" ſity and magnanimity.—To the preſervation of
" that character, exemption from error never was
" ſuppoſed neceſſary." Whatever diminution Great Britain may have ſuffered in her magnanimity, ſhe is, I am perſuaded, ſtill remarkable for generoſity. Man being, at beſt, but an imperfect and mutable creature, all his virtues and qualifications are, like himſelf, tainted with imperfection, and ſubject to change.

You ſay, " Our public conduct has, indeed, been
" dreadfully fallible, and we have much to anſwer
" for, and much to repair—but, if public virtue be
" not wholly gone from us, if we ſtill wiſh to be
" venerable among the nations of the earth, let us,
" above all things, diſcard, in the fulneſs of diſ-
" dain, that low vindictive principle of womanly
" reſentment, which incites to ſecret malignity
" and revenge, when open and avowed hoſtility
" has failed of its purpoſe." Although I readily join with you in the firſt branch of this ſentence, I probably differ widely from you reſpecting thoſe

acts

acts to which I allude. Though public virtue ſeems to be at a very low ebb, I truſt that it is not yet wholly gone from us; and I am convinced, that a very great majority of the community ſtill wiſh Great Britain to be venerable among the nations of the earth. The remainder of the ſentence conveys, in my opinion, an illiberal reflection on the conduct and ſituation of our country. Diſcard, above all things, and in the fulneſs of *diſdain*, that low vindictive principle of womanly reſentment. This, Sir, has much the appearance of a vindictive expreſſion. For my part I know of no inſtance in our public conduct which diſcovers a *ſecret* malignity and revenge, nor have you thought proper to ſtate any, unleſs the proclamation of the ſecond of June, 1783, which you have given in page 7th can be called *ſecret*. Our open and avowed hoſtilities would, in all human probability, have ſucceeded againſt the Revolted Colonies, but for the daring and unnatural conduct of their abetters here. *Here*, the cauſe of American rebellion was repeatedly and ably pleaded; *here* the battles of the Revolters were fought; and *here* they obtained thoſe victories, and that independency, of which they and their friends now ſo loudly boaſt.

You conclude your tract in the following words, "Surely, we are at this time ſufficiently hum-" bled, both in our own eyes and thoſe of the world, to learn a leſſon from the ſchool of afflic-

" tion.

" tion. If misfortunes like ours will not teach us " wiſdom, we are, indeed, a devoted people, and " fate has fixed her ſeal upon our ruin." That we are humbled, both in our own eyes and thoſe of the world, I freely admit; but whether we are *ſufficiently* humbled to learn a leſſon from our diſcipline in the ſchool of affliction, I ſhall not take upon me to determine. The fact, however, ſeems to be otherwiſe: inſtead of enquiring into the true cauſe of our misfortunes, and bringing delinquents to condign puniſhment, loyalty is diſcouraged, and the cauſe of rebellion promoted, by the laviſhing of honours and emoluments upon thoſe who appear to have been the principal cauſe of our want of ſucceſs in the late unhappy war, and who are even now ſtriving, who ſhall go fartherſt in promoting the intereſt of the Alien States of America, at the imminent hazard of their country. If the misfortunes we have met with, and the warnings we have received, do not teach us wiſdom, we ſhall have great reaſon to fear, that we are a devoted people; and that fate has fixed its ſeal upon our ruin.

I now proceed, Sir, to a few obſervations on two or three paſſages in your Appendix. In the repreſentation made to his Majeſty's Miniſters by *a committee of the Weſt India planters and merchants, held the* 11*th of April*, 1783, *in purſuance of the unanimous reſolution and appointment of a general meeting, expreſsly called for that purpoſe*; the third paragraph

paragraph runs in the following words: "The "dominions of the United States of America, and "his Majeſty's ſugar colonies, having been ſettled "in the expreſs view of ſupplying each other's "wants, it cannot be expected that the ſugar colo-"nies can ſubſiſt, in any degree of proſperity, "without thoſe ſupplies of lumber and proviſions "from America at the cheapeſt rate, in contem-"plation of which they were ſo ſettled, or with-"out the conſumption in North America of their "produce in return; and, although the exclu-"ſive right to that conſumption is no more, yet, "under a juſt and reaſonable attention to mutual "intereſts, the committee entertained no doubt but "ſuch a ſhare of the American trade may be pre-"ſerved to the ſugar colonies as will greatly tend "to their ſupport; and, upon every principle of "true policy, and proper regard to the views and "purpoſes of rival nations, be highly deſerving of "the utmoſt countenance and aſſiſtance from the "Mother Country. To this intercourſe the com-"mittee apprehend, the permiſſion of American "ſhips, as heretofore, freely to bring the produce "of the dominions of the United States to the ſu-"gar colonies, and take back our produce in "return, is ſo obviouſly eſſential, that they need "not adduce any farther arguments in ſupport of "that popoſition."

How far the coloniſts may be ſaid to have emi-grated to America and the Weſt Indies, in the expreſs

expreſs view of ſupplying each other's wants, I cannot pretend to ſay; but I am perſuaded, Sir, that the principal view of the Mother Country has uniformly been, the ſale of her manufactures, and the increaſe of her naval ſtrength. It is natural to ſuppoſe, that the Weſt India planters wiſh to obtain proviſions and lumber on as low terms as they poſſibly can; but it will not therefore follow, that the ſugar colonies cannot ſubſiſt, in *any* degree of proſperity, without ſuch ſupplies from America at the *cheapeſt rate*; or without the conſumption, in North America, of their produce in return. Our Weſt India planters, and the Americans, would doubtleſs be mutually benefited by a free intercourſe with each other; but Great Britain would certainly be very materially injured, if ſuch an intercourſe were allowed to be carried on by American ſhips: and therefore, Britain ought, in juſtice to herſelf, to refuſe the granting of that permiſſion, which, from motives of private intereſt, is now ſo earneſtly ſolicited, not to ſay ſtrenuouſly inſiſted on. As the American ſeamen will not, as formerly, be liable to ſerve in the royal navy in time of war; and as the number of Britiſh ſeamen muſt be diminiſhed, in proportion to the number of American ſeamen employed in carrying on the propoſed intercourſe, the Houſe of Bourbon will, virtually, gain ſuch an acceſſion of relative ſtrength as muſt imminently hazard the independence of the kingdom: and therefore the intercourſe, now

requeſted

requeſted by the Weſt India planters and merchants, ought, upon every principle of true policy, and proper regard to the views and purpoſes of rival nations, to meet with the utmoſt *diſcouragement* and *oppoſition* from the Mother Country.

In the copy of the humble addreſs of the grand inqueſt of the county of Middleſex, to his Excellency Archibald Campbell, Eſquire, governor of Jamaica, dated May 30, 1783, I find the following paſſage, viz. "With the moſt heartfelt ſatiſfaction, we have ſeen the earlieſt diſpoſition on "the part of America to ſupply us with thoſe articles which we moſt required, on which the "exiſtence of our ſugar-works much depend, "and which no quarter of the globe can furniſh "with equal diſpatch, certainty and abundance." That the grand inqueſt of the county of Middleſex, in the iſland of Jamaica, ſhould experience a heartfelt ſatisfaction, on ſeeing the Americans enter their ports with thoſe articles which they moſt wanted, is not to be wondered at; nor can we be much ſurpriſed at the early diſpoſition, on the part of the Americans, to furniſh them with ſuch a ſupply. Our Jamaica planters could not really think the American adventurers entitled to *much* merit, by their having ſtrove among themſelves who ſhould get firſt to the Weſt India market with a ſupply of thoſe articles, which, from their being then much wanted, muſt have been ſuppoſed to

fetch a very high price. The ſugar-works exiſted throughout the late war, although there was no intercourſe between our planters and the Americans during that period; and although the ſupplies from Britain and Ireland were in part intercepted by the enemy, and the remainder much loaded with high freight and inſurance. Canada and Nova Scotia, with the aſſiſtance of Britain and Ireland, can ſupply the wants of our Weſt India planters with as much certainty and abundance, as the United States of America. The trade will, indeed, require a greater number of ſhips than it formerly did, when the articles of ſupply were nearer to the Weſt India market, but that will be advantageous to Britain, in proportion to the increaſe which it will occaſion in the number of her ſeamen; and ſhould the ſupplies prove ſomewhat dearer to the planters than they formerly were, that *extra* expence will, as has already been obſerved, fall upon the conſumers of their produce.

After expreſſing their uneaſineſs on account of thoſe difficulties which had riſen, in clearing out American veſſels, and imploring his Excellency to remove every impediment, and to direct that every encouragement and diſpatch may be afforded to the citizens and veſſels of the United States of America, they ſay, "We ſhall otherwiſe ſee, "with a regret bordering upon deſpair, the trade "of that continent directed into the channel of

"our

" our natural enemies, and the enlivening gleam " of returning conciliation and fœderal union ob- " ſcured perhaps for ever!" The addreſſers could not be ignorant of that connexion which had for ſome years ſubſiſted between the Americans and their *great and good ally* the King of France. They knew that the principal part of the American trade had previouſly been directed into the channel of our natural enemies, and that it muſt be expected to continue to flow in that channel, except when the powerful motive of ſelf-intereſt ſhall induce the *faithful* allies of the *great friend to liberty* to give it a contrary direction. I can eaſily believe, that our Weſt India planters and the Americans are well diſpoſed for conciliation and a fœderal union with each other; but, with reſpect to Great Britain and America, I am perſuaded that conciliation is remote, and that a fœderal union would prove very diſgraceful and expenſive, if not alſo ruinous, to this country. After expending more than *one hundred millions ſterling* in endeavouring to compel their obedience, and prevent their independence, it would ſurely be madneſs in the extreme for us to hazard a greater expence, by an engagement to ſupport them in the future enjoyment of that very independency. The conduct of the Americans toward Great Britain has been ſtrongly marked with diſaffection, injuſtice, and ingratitude. In oppoſing what they falſely called tyranny in the Mother Country, they proceeded to

the moſt atrocious acts of cruelty againſt thoſe who refuſed to join in their daring rebellion; and, under the ſpecious pretext of aſſerting their liberty as Britiſh ſubjects, they formed an alliance with France, and aſſiſted its ambitious monarch in his baſe deſigns to ſubjugate their Parent State.

Having already made ſome obſervations on the *Repreſentation* of the Weſt India planters and merchants, publiſhed in the Appendix to your pamphlet, I now think it neceſſary to proceed to a few brief remarks on a tract lately publiſhed, by A RESOLUTION of the ſame gentlemen, dated London, May 14, 1784, and entitled, "*Conſide-* "*rations on the preſent State of the intercourſe be-* "*tween his Majeſty's* SUGAR COLONIES *and the* "*Dominions of the United States of* AMERICA." After quoting many paſſages, from the ſecond and third edition of Lord Sheffield's pamphlet, and ſtating an account of the total import from North America into the Britiſh Weſt India Iſlands, in the years 1771, 1772, and 1773, they ſay of Canada, in p. 62, "The trade affords no outward-bound "freight from Britain to Canada, beyond what "the ſhips returning from Canada to Britain can "carry out; and conſequently all ſhips ſent thi- "ther from Britain, to carry lumber or proviſions "to the Weſt Indies, muſt go in ballaſt at a rui- "nous expence." Here, Sir, the Weſt India planters and merchants are a little erroneous in their calculations; the articles exported from Britain to

Canada

Canada require *three times* more ſhipping than the goods imported from the latter into the former. The trade between Canada and the Weſt Indies will, I preſume, be chiefly carried on by veſſels which will continue to go between the two places; and between Nova Scotia and the latter, as has already been mentioned.

The wheat of *Lower* Canada is ſubject to a kind of mildew, which ſometimes does great injury to the crops. The gentlemen ſay, " No " quantities of winter-wheat have ever been ſown " in Canada, though ſome experiments of that " kind have been tried without any remarkable " ſucceſs." The truth, however, is, that almoſt all the wheat, ſown in Canada, is now winter wheat; and it is found to anſwer exceeding well. In giving an account of the exportation of wheat and flour from Canada, they ſay: " before the year " 1772, there was none." But I take leave to ſay, that a veſſel, belonging to a gentleman of my acquaintance, took in a cargo of wheat at Quebec for Liſbon in 1763, which is no leſs than *nine years* prior to the period ſtated by our authors, as the original commencement of its exportation.

Although the white-oak ſtaves of Canada have hitherto been manufactured to a ſize fit for the London market, becauſe there was no demand elſewhere, the *reſolving* gentlemen ſurely know, that they can be manufactured to a ſize fit for the Weſt Indies, and that the London market can,

in

in ſuch caſe, be ſupplied from the Eaſt Country. But Canada can ſupply both the Weſt Indies and London, if required. Here, Sir, it may be neceſſary to obſerve, that none of the American ſtaves are fit for making butts and vats for their diſtilleries. ——There not having been any ſhips built in the province of Canada, ſince ſome years before the laſt war, has not been owing to any want of timber ſuitable for ſhip-building, but merely from a want of proper encouragement.

Although Nova Scotia has never yet exported any conſiderable quantity of lumber, the province certainly abounds with wood fit for that purpoſe. The great number of houſes, immediately wanted at Port-Roſeway, being duly conſidered, a temporary importation of materials proper for building, cannot be wondered at: but when the great hurry of building is over, and when ſaw-mills are erected, and men at leiſure to cut lumber, great quantities may be expected for the Weſt India market: and as there is plenty of timber for ſhip-building in Nova Scotia, proper perſons will doubtleſs ſettle there, for the purpoſe of carrying on that valuable branch of buſineſs, provided that they meet with proper encouragement.

In the 37th page of the *Conſiderations*, the gentlemen ſay, " Our agriculture, manufac-" tures and commerce, have riſen to great-" neſs; and navigation and naval power have riſen " in their train:" but I take leave, Sir, to ſay that

that, as navigation is the only means whereby commerce can be carried on, and without which it never did, or can poſſibly exiſt, navigation muſt be prior to commerce; and, conſequently, cannot be ſaid to have riſen in its train. "But (ſay they) navigation and naval power are among the *happy fruits*, not the *parents* of commerce; for if agriculture and manufactures, and mutual wants, did not furniſh the ſubject of intercourſe between diſtant countries, there muſt ſoon be an end of navigation." Here, Sir, I take upon me to deny the gentlemen's aſſertion, and pronounce their reaſoning fallacious. Navigation, by the priority of its exiſtence, may juſtly be called the *parent* of commerce; and naval power may properly be deemed the *happy fruit* of the two. So far as the produce of agriculture, and our manufactures, are deſigned to exceed the demand for home conſumption, they muſt be conſidered as originally intended for exportation, and may, therefore, be juſtly denominated the *effects*, not the *cauſe* of navigation: for who, as you have obſerved of the ſugar planters, will raiſe articles at a great expence, which he can neither conſume himſelf, nor diſpoſe of to others. "The *carrying trade* is of great importance (ſay our authors) but it is of greater ſtill *to have trade to carry*." That is, in other words, the carrying *buſineſs* is of great importance, but it is of greater ſtill to have *buſineſs* to carry. "Encourage cultivation and manufactures

("ſay

" (ſay they) and promote a demand for their pro-
" duce, and render its conveyance to market eaſy,
" and the benefits of navigation will follow of
" courſe." To the whole of this ſentence I readily ſubſcribe: but I am apt nevertheleſs, to think, that our authors wiſh their readers to underſtand the *benefits* of navigation to mean navigation itſelf; for otherwiſe, the paſſage would, in my opinion, have run much better thus: 'Increaſe *cultivation* 'and *manufactures*, promote a demand for their 'produce, and render its *conveyance* to market 'eaſy, and the benefits of *all the three* will follow 'of courſe.' The *reſolving* gentlemen, in their eagerneſs to *exalt* commerce, and *depreciate* navigation, have proceeded in ſuch a manner as muſt excite the riſible faculties of *ſome* of their readers. Thoſe who, with ſeeming pleaſure, criticiſe on the expreſſions of others, ought to be particularly careful to keep themſelves beyond the reach of criticiſm. Agriculture and manufactures furniſh the *articles*, or *ſubjects* of commerce, and navigation is the *act of carrying* them to diſtant places, where the *exchanging*, or the *ſelling* and *buying* of them, conſtitutes that which we call commerce. All are dependent on each other, and naval power flows from the whole.

In page 39, the gentlemen ſay: " The expence
" of navigation in long voyages is vaſtly higher,
" in proportion to the length thereof, than in
" ſhort ones." Here, Sir, I take leave to contradict

the aſſertion, by ſaying that the expence of navigation in long voyages is *much lower*, in proportion to the length thereof, than in ſhort ones; provided that the longeſt voyage does not exceed one year, at the end of which period, ſhips want a general caulking and refitting.—In the next page our authors inſiſt, that Canada, Nova Scotia, Bermuda, and our Weſt India Iſlands, are all incapable of furniſhing the number of ſhips or quantity of tonnage neceſſary for the carrying of thoſe ſupplies which are wanted. But they ought to have recollected, that the great number of Britiſh ſhips now wanting employment are much more than ſufficient to ſupply all that can be wanted.

In page 47, our authors ſay, "Our iſlands were "driven by neceſſity to that worſt of all applica- "tions, for the public good of their own labour, "viz. the raiſing proviſions, and cutting lumber "upon their own eſtates. It is evident that the "public can only be profited by the application "of that labour to the cultivation and manufac- "ture of articles of commerce; and as far as any "regulations tend to make it more for the intereſt "of the planter to raiſe any thing elſe upon his "eſtate, they, by inevitable conſequence, deſtroy "ſo much of his power to produce articles of "commerce."

Here, Sir, I have the pleaſure of fully coinciding in opinion with the Weſt India planters and merchants. No part of their labour, excepting

 that

that which is appropriated to the cultivation and manufacture of articles of commerce, can be of any real advantage to the public. But the commerce, ſo much contended for, is an intercourſe between the Alien States of America and our Weſt India Iſlands, and therefore, Great Britain, inſtead of being benefited, would be greatly injured by it. So far as the commercial intercourſe ſhould be carried on by American ſhips, we ſhould ſuffer loſs; and in proportion as their naval force ſhould be augmented by ſuch navigation, ours would be diminiſhed. Our ſugar planters had much better raiſe proviſions and cut lumber upon their own eſtates, than apply their labour to the cultivation and manufacture of ſuch articles of commerce as their parent ſtate can neither conſume herſelf, nor find a market for, and thereby avoid the twofold neceſſity, now ſo ſtrenuouſly inſiſted on, of granting permiſſion to foreign ſtates to trade with them in their own ſhips.

Our authors, in endeavouring to enforce their favourite meaſure, of granting the Americans a free trade with our Weſt India Iſlands, by the fear of otherwiſe driving them into the arms of France, ſeem to forget, that, in the year 1779, America put herſelf into that unnatural ſituation, and continued her utmoſt exertions, throughout the ſubſequent proſecution of the war, to effect the *aggrandiſement* of her new ally, and the *ruin* of her Parent State. As *ſimilarity of language, religion, manners, laws, ancient*

ancient habits, and individual connexions, could not *prevent* the Americans from ruſhing into the embraces of our natural enemy, we ſurely ought not to narrow our commerce, and diminiſh our naval force, under a fooliſh notion of thereby effecting a ſeparation. If even gold itſelf may be bought too dear, the danger of loſing cannot be leſs, reſpecting baſer mettle.

In page 51, the *reſolving* gentlemen ſay, "Hard, "indeed, would be the lot of the ſugar colonies, "if, whilſt both Britain and Ireland enjoy the freeſt "intercourſe with the Americans in American "ſhips, they, to whom *alone*, from local circum-"ſtances, that mode of intercourſe is *eſſential*, "ſhould ſtand precluded from it." Here our authors ſeem to conſider our ſugar colonies as being totally independent of Britain, and equally entitled with her to the freedom of trade; more eſpecially to a free commercial intercourſe with their *neighbours* the Americans, in American ſhips: but our Weſt India colonies are not independent, nor will their vicinity to America entitle them to a free intercourſe with the United States, now become aliens to them, and to their Parent State.

Our authors endeavour to ſhew, in their concluding paragraph, the neceſſity of allowing the Americans a free trade with our Weſt India Iſlands in American ſhips, by ſuppoſing that we ſhall not be able to keep up ſuch a ſtock of Britiſh ſhipping as will be wanted. They ſuppoſe, that the great

number of American ſhips, now in our merchants ſervice, will ſoon wear out; they doubt, whether we can replace them with Britiſh-built ſhips, without too much exhauſting the timber of the kingdom before it comes to the growth fit for large ſhips; and they ſay, "To build ſhips in England "with imported timber will never anſwer; and it "muſt not be forgot, that every increaſe of the "price of a ſhip operates as a tax upon the manu- "factures and commerce which ſhe is to tran- "ſport."

That the great number of our American-built ſhips will ſoon wear out, I readily admit, but I am far from thinking that they cannot be replaced, without the making of ſhips built in the United State's free bottoms; nor can I poſſibly believe, that the building of ſhips in England, with imported timber, will *never* anſwer. As great quantities of timber have been imported for ſhip-building, I am led to think, that the like may again be done with equal advantage.—That every increaſe in the price of a ſhip operates as a tax upon thoſe articles of commerce which ſhe is to tranſport, is true, when ſuch increaſe happens to be conſiderable; but here, Sir, it is neceſſary to obſerve, that as Britiſh-built ſhips will, on an average, laſt *twice* as long as thoſe built in the United States, the former will often prove cheaper in the end than the latter. In time of peace the Britiſh-built ſhips will have greatly the advantage in obtaining freight: in time of war the

the merchants are not ſo nice in chooſing ſhips for freight, and then thoſe built in America will, by the lowneſs of their value, ſave conſiderably in the article of inſurance.—Whether the Weſt India planters and merchants ſtand, as they ſay in the cloſe of their pamphlet, " ſupported by facts incon-
" trovertible, and oppoſed by no argument that
" does not ſap the foundation of the very intereſts
" it profeſſes to ſupport," let the imprtial public judge.

Having juſt read the Poſtſcript to the ſecond edition of your pamphlet, I take leave to make the following brief remarks thereon: in one part you tell us, *the Americans are never likely to become our rivals in trade and manufactures*; and in a ſubſe-quent paſſage you ſay, " No folly can exceed that
" of conceiving that any thing Great Britain can
" do will prevent the American States from hav-
" ing, *ſome time or other* a commercial intercourſe
" with our Weſt India Iſlands on their own terms." I think, Sir, I may be allowed to ſay, you will find it difficult, if not impoſſible, to reconcile the two paſſages.

In page 12 you ſay, " The preſent reſtrain-
" ing ſyſtem is forbidding men to help each
" other. Men who, by their climate and pro-
" ductions, are ſtanding in perpetual need of
" mutual aſſiſtance. But our efforts are as fu-
" tile as they are malicious. America will hold
" them in deriſion, and remind us of the *viper*

" *and*

"*and the file.*" I flatly deny, Sir, that our preſent reſtraining ſyſtem is forbidding men to help each other, any further than ſuch help has a manifeſt tendency to injure thoſe who have an indiſputable right to determine on the ſubject. America has, by the aſſiſtance of France, violently torn herſelf from the Britiſh Empire; the United States have thereby rendered themſelves Aliens to Britain, and they ought to be treated accordingly. You have, indeed, thought proper to call the ſtiling of the Americans a *foreign* people, a *puerile and offenſive affectation*, but I deny the charge, and defey you to prove, that they have the leaſt ſhadow of right to a contrary appellation. As they are not Britiſh ſubjects, they muſt be deemed foreigners; there cannot poſſibly be any middle rank or order, and therefore, the charge of puerile and offenſive affectation lies properly againſt yourſelf. *Puerile* it muſt be held, becauſe it has an imaginary being, a mere non-entity for its object; and *offenſive* it certainly will prove, to all who love loyalty and abhor rebellion.—Whether our efforts to reſtrain the Americans from trading with our Weſt India Iſlands, will, or will not, prove *futile*, I ſhall not take upon me to determine, but few, I truſt, will think them malicious: for my part, I can truly ſay, that I view them in a very different light. Great Britain certainly has an excluſive right to the trade of her Weſt India Iſlands: on the other hand,

hand, the Alien States of America inſiſt upon ſupplying them with proviſions and lumber in their own ſhips; and our ſugar planters are in effect ſaying, "we will not be ſupplied through any other "channel." But as Great Britain has, at a very great expence, ſettled, nouriſhed, and protected her colonies, for the important purpoſes of increaſing the conſumption of her manufactures, and the ſtrengthening of her navy, they ought never to loſe ſight of thoſe grand objects, except when dire neceſſity calls for ſuch a ſacrifice. Whether the Americans will treat our reſtricting efforts with *deriſion*, and remind us of the *viper and the file*, I do not pretend to know, but, however that may be, I think I am warranted to ſay, that *your* efforts do not ſeem to be the *moſt* likely to command reſpect. So long as Britain ſhall continue miſtreſs of the ocean, ſhe will be able to protect her ſugar colonies, and preſerve the monopoly of their trade; but ſhould ſhe, by yielding to the importunities of ſelf-intereſted men, unfortunately loſe her naval ſuperiority, her colonies will thenceforward be expoſed to the depredations of every invader; and even her own independency will be in imminent danger of falling a ſacrifice to the boundleſs pride and ambition of the Houſe of Bourbon.

The Weſt India planters and merchants, in order to remove every objection to the intercourſe between America and the Weſt Indies, in American ſhips, propoſe the limiting of it to veſſels of eighty

or

or one hundred tons burthen; but ſuch a meaſure would be highly injurious to Britain, and manifeſt injuſtice to her remaining provinces. The advocates for that ſcheme ſay, that "ſuch veſſels can "never be to any extent employed in tranſporting "ſugar acroſs the Atlantic; nor could they be "got inſured." But I heſitate not to ſay, that the gentlemen are egregiouſly miſtaken in both branches of the ſentence. Such veſſels would probably be rated at only two-thirds of their meaſurement-tonnage, and carry double the quantity in heavy articles; conſequently, thoſe rated at eighty or one hundred tons would carry one hundred and ſixty, or two hundred tons dead-weight. As to the article of inſurance, many would prefer them to ſhips of greater burthen; and even veſſels of eighty tons dead-weight would readily find underwriters.

Much has been ſaid, Sir, by you and others in order to depreciate our remaining colonies in North America; but if they receive that encouragement and protection from this country which they have a right to expect, they will ſoon become an honour to themſelves, a ſupport to our Weſt India Iſlands, and the envy of the thirteen States. You ſay that Canada and Nova Scotia, with all the aſſiſtance that Britain and Ireland can give, will be incapable of ſupplying our ſugar iſlands with proviſions and ſlumber; and that the produce of all our fiſheries will prove inadequate to the demand for cod, mackrel, and ſhad: but, when the

trial

trial is fairly made, ſtubborn facts will fully prove the contrary to be true. Our Weſt India Iſlands are far from being in want. Nova Scotia alone will ſoon be able to ſupply them with lumber, and our fiſheries can well ſupply their wants, in the article of fiſh, were they *five times greater* than really they are. It has been repeatedly ſaid, that we ought to be cautious in raiſing Nova Scotia to opulence and power, leſt we thereby add a fourteenth ſtripe to the American flag. Allowing the caution to be proper, it certainly cannot be deemed *leſs* neceſſary, reſpecting our ſugar colonies. But the Loyaliſts have ſtood a moſt ſevere trial, and may therefore be fully truſted. They have been driven from the United States, on account of their loyalty to their Sovereign, and attachment to their parent State; and they have ſettled in our remaining colonies, on the faith of receiving ample encouragement and protection from this country. But their former perſecutors, encouraged by their *patriotic* friends here, are purſuing them ſtill, and may, ſhould they prove ſucceſsful, ſoon drive them into the arms of France. Yes, Sir, I ſay into the arms of France; for, if the Americans are allowed a free intercourſe with our Weſt India Iſlands in veſſels of any burthen whatever, the laudable views of the Loyaliſts will be intirely defeated, the hopes of our remaining provinces wholly fruſtrated, the honour of Britain *more* ſhamefully tarniſhed, her naval force more materially dinimiſhed, and her extenſive Empire every where expoſed to the hoſtile attacks of her ambitious enemies. In ſhort, Sir,

ſhould thoſe meaſures, which are now ſo ſtrenuouſly inſiſted on, by ſelf-intereſted and party-men, be carried into execution, that national ruin, which appears lately to have been advancing with haſty ſtrides, will, in all human probability, ſoon overtake us; and an injured people will ſee the fatal effects of their credulity when too late for redreſs.

Whoever duly conſiders the national importance of our manufacturers, our ſhip-carpenters, and our ſeamen, muſt wonder how any Briton can openly attempt to reduce their numbers: but his aſtoniſhment muſt be greatly increaſed, by ſeeing our Weſt India planters and merchants ſtraining every nerve to effect that ruinous purpoſe! America, whoſe market will ſoon be ſtored with the manufactures of all the European nations, and whoſe numerous agents are now ſedulouſly employed in enticing our manufacturers to emigrate thither, muſt have a free intercourſe with our Weſt India Iſlands, in order to ſupply them with thoſe articles which, otherwiſe, would furniſh employment for a great number of our ſhipping and ſeamen. Ship-building, ſay they, muſt not be encouraged in Nova Scotia; for, as there are at preſent few or no ſhip-builders there, it would occaſion the emigration of artiſans from Great Britain and Ireland. But American ſhips, according to their patriotic ſcheme, ought to be deemed Britiſh, when bought here, or "ſome "accommodating plan of *adoption in Nova Scotia* "ſhould be fallen upon." In the latter caſe, Sir,

our

our ſhip-carpenters might chuſe, whether they would follow the ſhip-building buſineſs into the United States of America, remain idle at home, or get into ſome other employment. As our ability to build, repair, and man our ſhips of war, muſt always depend upon the numbers of our ſhip-carpenters and ſeamen employed in time of peace, every meaſure, calculated to reduce them, muſt proportionably cramp our naval exertions, and prove favourable to the enemy. Hence thoſe Britons, who recommend ſuch pernicious meaſures, ought to be deemed enemies to their country; and that Miniſter, who dares to adopt them, ſhould be held highly culpable for his conduct. Such meaſures have been repeatedly and ſtrongly recommended by men of conſiderable weight and influence in the community, whether his Majeſty's Miniſters will attempt the carrying of them into execution, remains yet uncertain; ſhould they venture to make it, they will thereby evince their want of regard for the welfare of their country; and ſhould they, by the concurrence of Parliament, prove ſucceſsful in their endeavours, the following very momentous queſtion may, ere long, preſent itſelf to the perturbed mind of an injured public; namely, ſhall we endeavour to preſerve the independence of our country, by parting with that conſtitution which has long been the pride of our iſle, and the envy of the ſurrounding nations; or continue to ſupport the latter, until, by the decided ſuperiority of home and foreign enemies, both ſhall unfortunately fall together.

Lord

Lord Sheffield deſerves highly of his country; for the great pains he has taken to avert thoſe evils which have for ſome time paſt threatened it; and his numerous opponents will probably think themſelves entitled to ſome merit with the United States of America. I am perſuaded that his Lordſhip's motives for writing have been very laudable; and, for myſelf, I can truly ſay, that I have been actuated by a real regard for the welfare of my country, and a ſincere wiſh to overturn that ſcheme which muſt otherwiſe be productive of commercial ruin and ſlaviſh dependence. Whether I have refuted your arguments, in favour of a free commercial intercourſe between our Weſt India Iſlands and the United States of America, the impartial public will judge; and how far my arguments will be found to operate againſt that pernicious meaſure, time only can ſhew. However thoſe may be, I can, with the ſtricteſt truth declare, that I have been nowiſe influenced by party-prejudice, nor actuated by ſelf-intereſted motives. What you will think of this Addreſs, I cannot pretend to ſay; nor do I know, how it will influence your future conduct. Should you apprehend that I have erred in any particular, you need only refer to the exceptionable paſſage, and you will always find a readineſs, to give up cheerfully or defend ſtrenuouſly, as the caſe ſhall require,

In, SIR,

Your moſt humble Servant,

London, June 10th, 1784.

JOHN STEVENSON.

BRITISH MUSEUM